School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1402601

The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

https://archive.org/details/publicappealsinb0002char

PUBLIC APPEALS

IN BEHALF OF

CHRISTIAN UNITY.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Crown 8vo, 296 pp., price 4s. 6d.

OUTLINES OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY DELINEATED AND brought to the test of Reason, Holy Scripture, History, and Experience, with a view to the Reconciliation of existing differences concerning it, especially between Presbyterians and Episcopalians.

SOLD BY R. GRANT & SON, 107 PRINCES STREET, EDINBURGH.

2nd Edition, price 2s. 6d.

SOME REMARKS ON BISHOP LIGHTFOOT'S DISSERTATION ON THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

*** *This work may be regarded as the complement of the preceding.*

Price 2s. 6d.

A DISCOURSE ON SCOTTISH CHURCH HISTORY FROM THE REFORMATION TO THE PRESENT TIME.

In 3 Vols., crown 8vo, price 7s. 6d. each.

SHAKSPEARE'S HISTORICAL PLAYS, ROMAN AND ENGLISH.

IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER.

With Revised Text, Introductions, and Notes Glossarial, Critical, and Historical.

"We may say at once that the Bishop is *félix totius operæ*. . . . We commend the book to all schoolmasters, and hope it may find a place in every school library."—*Journal of Education.*

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD & SONS, EDINBURGH AND LONDON.

3rd Edition, crown 8vo, price 7s. 6d.

(Bound Copies, calf, 12s., morocco, 16s., may be obtained from the Publishers.)

SHAKSPEARE'S KNOWLEDGE AND USE OF THE BIBLE.

Recommended as a Prize-Book for Schools and Colleges for both sexes.

LONDON: SMITH, ELDER & CO., 15 WATERLOO PLACE.

320
6
.2

PUBLIC APPEALS

IN BEHALF OF

CHRISTIAN UNITY

WITH REFERENCE TO THE PRESENT CONDITION OF THE CHURCH IN SCOTLAND.

BY

CHARLES WORDSWORTH, D.D., D.C.L.,
BISHOP OF ST ANDREWS.

"Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also that shall believe on Me, through their word, that they all may be one . . . . that the world may believe that THOU hast sent ME."—S. JOHN xvii. 20, 21.

VOL. II.

EDINBURGH:
MACNIVEN & WALLACE.
1886.

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

CONTENTS OF SECOND VOLUME.

VII.

PLEA FOR UNIFORMITY IN MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH.

(*Synodal Address*, 1868.)

PAGE

Introduction.—Arguments of the Address untouched by the Correspondence it called forth—Rev. A. C. Macdonald's Letter from Jerusalem—Apology for Repetitions. ADDRESS.—Dr Caird's Argument for Diversity of Church Government.—Never accepted by the Church—Untenable on Ground of Expediency—"Means and Ends"—Church Doctrine and Church Government similarly proved—Scripture Proof of Three-fold Ministry—Effects of Schism on National Character—And on Propagation of the Gospel—Human Preference *versus* Divine Authority. *Appendix.*—(1) Hooker quoted by Hallam—(2) Diversity of Ministry, the Hindrance to Conversion of Heathen—Testimonies. *P.S.*—Extracts from Correspondence in Proof of Interest in the Cause of Union . 341-388

VIII.

RESPONSE OF EPISCOPALIANS TO MODERATOR'S APPEAL.

(*Synodal Address*, 1864.)

Introduction.—Dr Pirie's Silence—Reprint by Major Scott of Gala — Welsh Translation, through Bishop Oliphant. ADDRESS.—Dr Pirie's Challenge (Moderator, 1864) considered *seriatim*—(1) Three Orders proper to Church Constitution — Nomenclature changed—Offices distinct — Bingham's Antiquities, Book IX.; (2) Scriptural Evidence —Three-fold Ministry under the Law—Under Christ—

PAGE

Under His Apostles—Gradually organised throughout—Three Apostolic Periods—Accepted as Scriptural by Early Church—Aerius. (3) "Means and Ends;" dangerous to separate what God has joined—Intimate Relation between the Faith and Polity of a Church; (4) United Church for United Kingdom—Distinction between Church Government and Civil Government—Recapitulation — Disabilities removed — Indigenous Clergy 393-457

IX.

MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

(*Synodal Address*, 1866.)

Introduction.—Episcopacy compatible with full Synodal System—Church Establishment—Extracts from Charge, 1865, on (1) Our Immediate Duties as Episcopal Clergy; (2) Our Duties towards those now separated from us. ADDRESS.—*Historical* Evidence of Three-fold Ministry—Jerusalem, Ephesus—Antioch, Alexandria, Rome—Dr Candlish and Principal Cunningham on Deductions from Holy Scripture—Three-fold Ministry universal in Fourth Century—Aerius considered Heretical—Evidence from Church Councils—Reformation Period; Shifting Foundation of Presbyterianism—Great Rebellion; Sir E. Dering's Testimony—Revolution; Secular Policy of King William—Expediency of Presbyterianism more than questionable, as shown in details—Dr Lee's Reform of worship imperfect without Reform of Ministry—Summary 463-521

X.

EUODIAS AND SYNTYCHE;—THE SCOTTISH CHURCH IN ITS RELATIONS, PAST AND PRESENT, TO THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

(*Sermon at Chichester Cathedral*, 1867.)

Introduction.—Sermon at St Lawrence, and Chichester Cathedral—Dr Hook—Extracts from Charge, 1867; Archbishop Longley at Inverness—Lambeth Conference, Three Objects of, considered—Regret at neces-

PAGE

sary Absence of Presbyterians — And at Presbyterian Exclusiveness, as represented by Dr Crawford (Moderator, 1867)—Political Tendency of Parity—Original Preface. SERMON.—*Visible* Unity, St Paul's desire—Causes of Breach of Unity between England and Scotland, at Reformation—King James' attempts at Church Union, a failure—Solemn League and Covenant—Westminster Assembly — Episcopacy restored, A.D. 1661—Allegiance of Bishops to the Stuarts—Its Consequence—Presbyterian Divisions — English Indifference to Religious State of Scotland—Progress of Scottish Episcopal Church 527-589

XI.

PROSPECTS OF RECONCILIATION BETWEEN PRESBYTERY AND EPISCOPACY.

(*Synodal Address*, 1882.)

Introduction.—Fifteen Years Interval—Charges, &c.—New Testament Revision—Extract from Charge, 1881, on Revised Nomenclature of the Three Orders — Correspondence with Principal Tulloch on Hooker and Leighton —Diocesan Conference, 1868—Scotch Establishment—Dr Norman Macleod's Address (Moderator, 1869)—Extracts from Charge, 1871, on Remarks of Dr R. Wallace and Mr Goldwin Smith—Hindrances on our Part to the Cause of Union—Publication of "Remarks on Bishop Lightfoot's Essay," 1879—Duke of Argyle's Analogy refuted—St Giles' Lectures—Author's "Discourse on Scottish Church History," 1881. ADDRESS.—Dr Milligan's Addresses—At Detroit, 1872—As Moderator, 1882—And Principal Tulloch's Speech—Moderator's Office too short-lived for action—Disruption of Presbyterianism from the past—General Assembly, its Backbone—Coalition possible between Prelacy and General Assembly—Dr Sprott's Lectures examined—His Theory of a Two-fold Ministry—Danger from tampering with Catholic Tradition—Best means of promoting Unity 595-661

XII.

Case of Non-Episcopal Ordination in Reference to Scotland Fairly Considered.

(*Synodal Address*, 1885.)

PAGE

Introduction.—The Author's Work, a Seed-Sowing—Various Encouragements, and the Reverse — Extract from Charge, 1884—General Assembly's Resolution—"Unreal and Reactionary"—Dr Cunningham—A "Parish Minister"—"O si sic Omnia!"—Duke of Argyle's Glasgow Speech, 1885—Presbyterian Ordination to be considered with reference to its History—Dr Hatch's Pseudo-Unity—Our Disunion, rather in Church Government than in Doctrine. Address.—Presbyterianism, originally, the Consequence of Popery—Its Continuance due to Reaction from despotism—Now, "Divided against itself"—Presbyterian Ordination, *Irregular*, rather than *Invalid*—Compare Archbishop Bramhall—Evidence of its Fruits—*But* the Fruit of Unity Lacking from Neglect of its Divinely-appointed Safeguard—The Question—not of Prelacy against Parity but of Unity or Schism in the Mystical Body of Christ—Dr Hanna—Bishop Cotterill in Harmony with the Author—Approaching Bicentenary of 1689. *Appendix.*—(1) Episcopalians, how diminished—(2) Their genuine Nationality 667-721

INTRODUCTION.

IN the next year after the Moderatorship of Dr Bisset, whose Address was referred to in the foregoing number of this series, an article appeared in *Good Words* from the pen of Dr Caird, one of the most eminent of the ministers of the established Church, and now Principal of the University of Glasgow, in which he dealt with the subject of Church Ministry and Government as one on which Christians had been left free to follow the guidance of their own judgment; and consequently argued that a variety of systems was not to be condemned, but rather to be acquiesced in, or even welcomed as desirable. In my Synodal Address for that year, 1863, which was published at the time, and of which the greater part is now reprinted, I ventured to call in question the tenableness of the position which the said Article had maintained, and for which its appearance in a periodical, so generally and so deservedly popular, together with the weighty influence of the writer's name, could not fail to obtain a very wide and favourable reception. That address gave rise to an unusually large amount of correspondence in the Public Journals.[1] I have preserved between forty and fifty letters which appeared concerning it in *The Scotsman*, and *The Courant* alone; and no doubt there were

[1] See below, *Postscript*, p. 379.

many more in other papers which I did not see. This was owing mainly to the interest taken in the subject itself, but partly also, I suppose, to the high reputation of the Author of the Article, to which my Address was a reply; who, however, himself, so far as I am aware, did not notice it. On looking through that mass of letters after so long an interval (some of them so valuable that they well deserve to be re-printed), I can truly say there is not one that makes any attempt to grapple with my argument in favour of *Uniformity* of the Christian Ministry, or to support Dr Caird's in defence of *Diversity*.

The two short chapters of supplementary matter which the Reader will find at the end of the Address have been taken from the large Appendix to my "Discourse on the Scottish Reformation" as originally published. It will be seen that the former—on the opinion of Hooker, as quoted by Hallam—is immediately connected with the main subject of the Address itself; while the latter exhibits very vividly one, and perhaps the most deplorable, of the many evils, which arise from Disunion, or, in other words, from want of Uniformity in the Church's Ministry—viz., *the hindrance which it throws in the way of the conversion of the Heathen*. Testimonies to that effect are continually accumulating. Some of the most impressive which have been given since that chapter was compiled (including references to the memorable speech of Dr Norman Macleod in the General Assembly after his return from India, and to a striking sermon preached in the Cathedral of Colombo, by the late Bishop of that See, Dr Piers Claughton) may be found in my "Outlines of the

Christian Ministry," pp. 257-61; and the latest, and not the least instructive evidence to the same effect which has come to hand, may be seen in the following letter, which I had occasion to write to the *Scotsman* newspaper only a few weeks ago:—

EVIL EFFECTS OF DISUNION AT HOME UPON EVANGELISATION OF THE HEATHEN.

St Andrews, *March* 8, 1886.

"Sir,—The interesting letter of the Rev. A. C. Macdonald, written from Jerusalem, which appears in to-day's *Scotsman*, adds one more testimony—and a very valuable one it is—to the numberless others before given by missionaries to the sadly injurious effects of our divisions at home in hindering the progress of the Gospel throughout the world. His words are these:—'And I would have this Conference consider also, and particularly, the advisability of an immediate union of all the Presbyterian missions labouring among the heathen. *None except those who know it by personal experience can possibly realise how much the cause of the Gospel is hindered by such divisions as now exist among those heralds of the Cross.* It confounds the heathen. They cannot understand those divisions and cross purposes, and rather than embrace their doctrines they adhere to their own views, *and remain as they are.*'

"Truly a testimony worthy of the holy city from whence it comes. But why does it stop short at the home divisions of Presbyterians among themselves? Does no hindrance to the cause of the Gospel come from divisions between Presbyterians and Episcopalians? And how are *those* divisions to be justified? By all means let the Presbyterian bodies be *first* united, if that be found possible; but let no one suppose that such union will suffice either to remove the hindrances complained of, or to justify our nation in the sight of Almighty God. The praises of the Church of England, which we have heard on platforms from Presbyterian lips for *electioneering or anti-disestablishment purposes*, will testify against us."

I am fully conscious that in the following Address the Reader will meet with passages taking him over ground which has been already traversed in one or more of the foregoing numbers of this series, and which I may have occasion to revert to again in future numbers. In such cases of repetition, however, it may be noticed, once for all, that though the statement or argument itself may not be new, it will commonly be found to be introduced in a new connection, and to be placed in a somewhat different, and, it may be, more effective light. Moreover the extreme importance of the subject will, I hope, suffice to justify my anxious endeavour not only to leave no part of it unexplained, but to impress it with all the advantages of reiteration upon the Reader's mind. It is also to be remembered that in taking up the subject generally after a year's, or more than a year's interval, I felt the necessity of re-stating, from time to time, the main features of the case ; and all the more when, from much of the criticism which I had to encounter, I was too often made to perceive how thick was the mist of ignorance still remaining to be dispersed, and how persistent the hostility of prejudice still requiring to be overcome.

CHARLES WORDSWORTH,
Bishop of St Andrews.

April 16th, 1886.

PLEA FOR UNIFORMITY IN MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH.

[The opening part of this Address, in which I had occasion to notice the amendments introduced into our Code of Canons by the General Synod, 1862-3, is here omitted, as having no direct connection with the subject of these "Appeals."]

BRETHREN,—Having now discharged the duty which relates to our own internal affairs, I turn to considerations which affect us in regard to the main body of fellow-Christians among whom we dwell. The great question of our distinctive position as Churchmen, and of the grounds upon which it rests, is one which (as we have all too much reason to know and to lament) is very imperfectly understood. Even among the members of our own Communion there are but few, I fear, who sufficiently comprehend the true nature and extent of the reasoning which at once enables and requires us to maintain our cause; and which, if better understood, would, I cannot doubt, recommend that cause to many who are now indifferent, or opposed to it. On former occasions I have endeavoured, from time to time, to contribute something towards remedying this defect, venturing to produce some portion of the argument, or to suggest some mode of treating it, which I hoped might be of use; and there is a special reason

why I feel it my duty to recur to the subject at the present moment, and to make a similar endeavour, with the same hope.

In a publication[1] which circulates very generally among all classes, which aims to do, and is, I trust, successful in doing, much good service in the interests of religion, and which carries with it the authority of names entitled to the greatest respect, the view has been put forth that we incur no serious responsibility in regard to questions of the kind to which I now refer; that Christians are at liberty to become Episcopalians, Presbyterians, or Independents, at their own choice; inasmuch as, to quote the writer's own words, he does "not believe there is to be found in the Bible any prescribed and definite Church Polity; but that, while the great truths upon which the existence of the Church is based are immutable and everlasting, the arrangements of government and discipline, under which these truths are propagated and professed, have been by the Great Head of the Church left indeterminate and flexible." And this view is supported by two arguments, both of which are well adapted to satisfy and to please the popular mind at the present day.[2]

The first argument is, that all such arrangements

[1] *Good Words* for July 1863. Article by Rev. Dr Caird, now Principal of the University of Glasgow.

[2] (*a*) It did not seem necessary to notice a preliminary remark of Dr Caird, viz., that parts of the Church's organisation (for instance, the appointment of the Seven Deacons), arose out of incidental circumstances. No reason can be given why God should not employ the incidents in the History of the Church, as He employs all other incidents, in order to accomplish His own purposes in His own good time.

being only appointed as *means* to an *end*—which end is the attainment of Truth and Holiness—provided we become holy and profess the truth, provided the world be Christianised and souls be saved, it signifies little under what system, or by what machinery, these results be gained.

The other argument is, that as the best means for attaining any given end are those which are most adapted to the circumstances of the case, and as the circumstances of men are liable to continual change, according to differences of time and place, "it was *to be expected* that no rigid and unalterable form of government would be found in a Religion intended for *all* nations and for *all* times." And, in connection with this argument, we are reminded of the various forms of political government; and, finally, to bring the matter home to the existing state of things among ourselves, it is held to be only reasonable "to suppose that, considering the national diversities of character and history, Episcopacy may be best in England and Presbytery in Scotland."

Now, what is there to prevent *us* from accepting this view? In the first place, it is a view which *the Church has never accepted.* Nor would it meet, I imagine, with anything like general acceptance even among the members of the Body to which the writer himself belongs, and still less among other Presbyterians who have separated from the Established Church. It is true, we find in the *Scots Confession of Faith*, put forth by the original Reformers of this country in 1560, the following words:—"Not that we think that one Policy [in the Kirk] can be appointed for all ages, times, and places," c. xx.;

but at the time when the present standards—viz., the Catechisms and Confession of the Westminster Assembly—were adopted, that is, more than two centuries ago, Presbyterian writers were not in the habit of admitting—what we now see to be not only freely admitted, but strenuously maintained, at least by some—that Presbyterianism derives no sanction, except so far as any other form of Church Government may derive a sanction, from the Word of God. Had they done so, it may well be doubted whether the enthusiasm of their countrymen would have been excited so warmly and so extensively in its behalf, or would have sufficed to place it in the commanding position which it still occupies in this country, and which, for a short season (in the seventeenth century), it sought to occupy in England also. We owe it, no doubt, in part to the greater liberality of sentiment which now prevails, but we owe it also to the spread of a sounder knowledge upon these subjects, that it is no longer possible for good and pious men, such as the writer and the editor of the essay to which I refer, to maintain the arguments which the Covenanters employed, and by means of which they overthrew the system of Episcopacy, representing it (as they did) to be *a device of Satan, and directly contrary to the Word of God.*

But, in the next place—to argue the matter first upon the lowest ground—is the result of this view, as we already see it in operation amongst us, altogether satisfactory, or such as we can approve? Is it satisfactory that the upper and lower classes of our people should worship, as they now do, in great measure apart from each other? Is it satisfactory that the

great landholders as a body should feel themselves at liberty to adhere to Episcopacy, and worship apart from their tenants, their labourers, and, still worse, their domestics; and that domestics, labourers, and tenants should no less feel themselves at liberty to adhere, as a simple matter of choice, to Presbyterianism in any of its several organisations, and to worship apart from those who are responsible, in some degree, not only for their temporal, but for their spiritual welfare? Nay, is it satisfactory that the same liberty should extend even to families? Is it satisfactory to tell not only the master and servant, the poor and the rich, the educated and the uneducated, but the husband and the wife, the brother and the sister, the parent and the child, that they are severally at liberty to choose a simpler or a more elaborate ritual, to attach themselves to a ministry with or without gradation of Clerical Orders, according as they may individually be led by "natural temper, education, or other causes," or according as they may think to be "best for the culture of their religious nature"? Is this the genuine fruit of the gospel of Him "Who pleased not Himself"? (Rom. xv. 13.) Is this the Christianity which teaches us to be "all of one accord, of one mind"? Is this the measure we are to take of the divine command which requires us to glorify God not only "with one mind," but "with one mouth"? (Rom. xv. 6.) Is it not, also, possible that many of us may be misled, or may be unable and unfit to judge as to what may be best for us in such a case—as to what may constitute our true edification? Is not the whole question from this point of view one of religious habit and experience,

of religious knowledge and discernment, and consequently a question such as the mass of mankind are quite incompetent to deal with; and are not the ignorant and inexperienced, when thus left to themselves, liable to become the prey not of the best and wisest Minister who may appeal to them, but of the most self-sufficient, the most designing, and the most unscrupulous? And once more, is not the step a short and natural one from this entire freedom of choice to the conclusion, that the use of an ordained Clergy may be dispensed with altogether; and that every man is at liberty to become, if he pleases, his own Minister, and the Minister of all who are content to listen to him—self-taught, self-examined, self-ordained, self-sent? And where can this end but in utter insubordination and confusion, alien from the will of God, as manifested alike in His Word and in His works?

It may be inferred from what has now been said, that I am quite unable to acquiesce in the practical conclusion to which the writer whom I have quoted would desire to bring the minds of his readers—viz., that "as Episcopacy may be best in England, so Presbytery may be best in Scotland." Even on the lowest ground upon which we are now arguing—that is, the ground of expediency, under the supposition that the matter is left open to our own choice by the word and will of God—I cannot, I say, acquiesce in any such view. On the contrary, in no other sense do I believe that Presbytery is, or can be, best adapted for this country, except in so far that it falls in with, and so tends, not to correct, but rather to aggravate, what we must all regard as the least attractive fea-

tures in the national character. This is an observation which I should have been unwilling to make, had I not frequently heard it made by Scotchmen themselves, whose love of their country no man could dispute; and who, because they loved it, did not hesitate to regret that it has remained so long under the influence of an ecclesiastical system calculated in their opinion to retard its spiritual development, and to check the upgrowth of those humbler graces which the Gospel requires us most to cultivate.

Moreover, in answer to the plea which was urged in support of the argument in question from the analogy supposed to exist between political governments and the government of the Church,[1] two considerations may suffice to show that this analogy is not a just one :—

(1.) God has not constituted states so as to form *one catholic or universal whole;* neither has He taught us that *they* commit *sin* when they fail to act in brotherly harmony and communion with each other. But Christ *has so constituted His Church;* and He has taught us that *sin is committed*—the sin of schism—by the failure among Christians (and especially among those who hold constant intercourse with each other) of such harmony and such communion.

(2.) Again, we know that a diversity of government among nations does not prevent them from maintaining all those friendly relations which their circumstances may require for their mutual good; whereas, on the other hand, experience teaches us that religious intercourse and co-operation do not

[1] (*a*) On Hooker's opinion, as quoted by Hallam, upon this subject see below, Appendix, ch. i.

and cannot take place between ecclesiastical communities for their common benefit,—no, not when their members dwell in the same land and speak the same tongue,—not even when they are neighbours, friends, and relations, and their interests *as such* compel them to associate,—unless their form of church government, as well as their form of Christian doctrine, be substantially the same.

Proceeding, then, upon the conviction that the observations now made are just and true, so far from expecting that the form of Church Polity would be left undecided and open to our own choice, should we not rather conclude that God in His goodness, and in His wisdom, has not neglected to make *sufficient provision* in regard to both these points, upon which the visible and practical Unity of His Church depends; provision, I mean, for Uniformity of Doctrine, and provision also for Uniformity of Government? It may be said indeed, and said truly, that the latter is only *a means*, and the former a great *end*, of our Christian profession. But while we admit in a measure the truth of this representation, let us not forget how highly perilous it is, in the things of God, to attempt to draw (blind and ignorant as *we* are) any such broad distinctions between *means* and *ends*.[1] Under the law, Circumcision was a means. It had (so far as we can tell) no religious value in itself. Nevertheless, the uncircumcised man-child was to be cut off from among the people. In like manner the Sabbath was a means; but the man who gathered sticks on the Sabbath-day was put to

[1] (*a*) See my "Remarks on Bishop Lightfoot's Dissertation," p. 13, and below, No. 8 of this series, p. 437.

death, no less than if he had committed murder or idolatry. But it will be replied, perhaps, that he broke the express command of God; and *we* have no such command in favour of any one system of church government. True; but we *have* a command and guidance *which tend directly to the same result.* And this brings us to the point at which we may see plainly *the main reasons* why we ought not to accept the view set forth in the passages which I just now quoted, however specious and attractive it might appear at first sight. On the one hand, it is not *safe*, it is dangerous and presumptuous, to *assume* that we have no Scriptural command for Uniformity of Church Government, when we have Scriptural commands, repeated again and again, in express reference to matters ecclesiastical, to "obey them that have the rule over us," and "to be all of one mind."[1] On the other hand, it is *not right*, it is too narrow and contracted a course, to confine our search for the full knowledge of God's will upon a point like this to the letter of the New Testament. God does nothing in vain. He does not give us Revelation to teach what may be known without it—what may be learnt from matters of fact. If I take with me Scriptures such as these—"Obey them that have the rule over you," and "Be ye all of one mind"—and if I find as matter of fact (through the ordering of Christ and His Apostles, and under the providence of God) that within the first century, and before the death of St John, Episcopacy was established at Jerusalem, at

[1] See, for the former command, Heb. xiii. 7, 17; 1 Thess. v. 12: and for the latter, Phil. ii. 2, i. 27, iii. 16 Rom. xii. 16, xv. 5; 1 Cor. i. 10; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; 1 Pet. iii. 8.

Antioch, at Ephesus, at Rome, at Alexandria—*i.e.*, in the greatest cities of the three quarters of the world as then known (not to mention other places and countries of less importance); and if I find, moreover, that, from that time downwards—for fifteen centuries—a uniformity of this government, and *of no other*, was established wherever the Gospel was preached throughout the world; when I take with me *those texts*, and when I find (as I do[1] find) *these facts*, can it be said that God Himself has not settled this question, or that He has not given me, and given all of us, all the commandment and all the guidance we require?

But more than this. Let it not be supposed that God has dealt with us upon this matter in a different way, or that He has given us in regard to it less evidence of His will than He has done upon other matters, which most Christians would admit to be "prescribed and definite." I have already pointed out the danger of attempting to distinguish too broadly between what are called "means" and "ends" in things pertaining to God. I am now to show that we shall fall into a great mistake if we imagine that, under the Gospel, while *the means*, such as modes of worship and church government, have been left (as we are told) "indeterminate," *the ends*—one of which is allowed to be the knowledge of the Truth—are expressly and incontestably revealed. I say, it is a mistake to imagine that any such difference exists—that all is clear and certain as to the one, all dark and uncertain as to the other. For is it not the fact that men, all of whom profess to take Scripture as their guide, differ

[1] (*a*) See above, No. 4 of this series, p. 197, and below, No. 9.

as much (or more) about the most fundamental matters of doctrine (for instance, the doctrine of the Trinity, or the doctrine of the two Natures in the one Person of Christ) as they do about matters of worship and of church government? And at the same time I fully allow that Revelation has been given to us *most freely upon the points whereon it was most needed.* It cannot be said that it was most needed upon those matters which might be known sufficiently from historical records, and from the actual practice of the Church itself. And hence it is that even the writers who would persuade us that we have no sufficient sanction for insisting upon Uniformity of "church government," would themselves, I doubt not, insist upon *the practice of infant baptism;* would insist still more upon *the observance of the Lord's Day;* would insist, most of all, upon *the books which constitute the inspired Word of God;* would insist, I say, upon all these points as *sufficiently sanctioned by the Divine Will,* although there is *no express Scriptural determination* upon any one of them. They all rest upon the same *mixed sanction* (viz., the written Word interpreted by the testimony and practice of the Church) which we claim for the Uniformity of church government.

It is plain, therefore, that we ought not to be misled either by the statement which *assumes* that God has not declared His will upon this question, or by the reasoning which *supposes* that our means of ascertaining that will are confined to the letter of the New Testament. How much more wisely does the Church of England set the matter before us in the language which she has ever firmly and consistently held from

the time of the Reformation to the present hour? She knows that God has given us His written Word, but that He has also given us other means whereby knowledge and guidance upon a point like this may be looked for and obtained. Therefore she affirms:—"It is evident *unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors*"—not Holy Scripture alone, or ancient authors alone; but Holy Scripture and ancient authors—"that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."[1] And she knows nothing of any other Ministry as Divine, or Scriptural, or Apostolical, which does not consist of those three orders. Whatever courtesy she may sometimes have extended to *foreigners* who have had no choice except between Popery and Presbyterianism, *for herself and for her own country*, she has acted upon the principle that God "has appointed" these "diverse orders in His Church,"[2] and that He has not appointed merely Presbyters, still less appointed a system of Independence. The respected writer to whom I have referred, would teach us to condemn as "narrow-minded bigotry" any "endeavour to torture Scripture texts into the exclusive recognition of Episcopacy or Presbytery, or any one form of church polity." In this he is *impartial*. But is he also *consistent?* If we are not to believe in a Uniformity of church government, because we have, as he thinks, no one form *imperatively* laid down in Scripture, we may cease also, for the same reason, to believe, in the necessity of the practice of Infant Baptism, or of the

[1] (*a*) See above, No. 4 of this series, p. 156.
[2] (*a*) See 2nd Collect for Ember Weeks.

observance of the Lord's Day; we may cease to believe in the Canonical books of the Old and New Testament; nay, we may cease to believe even in the doctrine of the blessed Trinity. For how is it that we learn to believe that doctrine? It is thus.[1] We put together passages of Scripture which appear to us not only to justify such an interpretation, but to admit of no other; and we find that the same interpretation, the same doctrine—*three Persons and one God as the one only object of Christian worship*—has been always from the beginning received and taught in the Church. A Unitarian, perhaps, will tell us that to maintain this is "torturing of Scripture, and narrow-minded bigotry." But still it has been, is, and ever will be, the faith of the Universal Church. And how do we learn to believe the uniformity of church government, and this uniformity exhibited in a Ministry of three Orders? Precisely in the same way. We put together passages of Scripture, which appear to us not only to justify such an interpretation, but to admit of no other; and find that the same interpretation, and the same uniform arrangement, for the Ministry of God's Word and Sacraments, has been always from the beginning received and practised in the Church.

In stating the matter as I have now done, I am aware that I have put what was, in point of fact, the latter of two things before the former: the Ministry and Government of the Church having existed at least to some extent before the existence of the body of the inspired writings which constitute the New Testament. Nevertheless, it is *true* that in the

[1] (*a*) See Hooker, "E.P.", Book i. c. xiv. 2.

present divided state of Christendom, and at this distance of time from the first *preaching* of the Gospel, we do now-a-days make the Bible not only our most authoritative, but our *primary* referee. Otherwise, it would have been more correct—because more consistent with the truth as it was *at first*, and was designed *always* to be—to put the argument as follows:—

All Christians owe it to the testimony of the Church that they receive without scruple the canonical books of the Old and New Testament. *All orthodox Christians* owe it to the teaching of the Church in her Creeds, that they receive without scruple the great doctrines of the Faith. And *we "Episcopalians"* owe it no less to the teaching, the testimony, and the practice of the Church in her Ministry, that we receive without scruple the form of church worship and of church government which we maintain.

Not as though the Scripture is of no avail to effect belief upon those points. *It is of avail*—much more, *it is indispensable*—to confirm us in the conviction which upon such testimony we entertain, and *to prevent us from accepting* what a corrupt tradition in matters of faith, and (for the most part) of practice also, might seek at any time to impose upon us.

And what are the passages which we put together for the purpose of discovering God's will in regard to the Government and Ministry of His Church? We may begin with a text which, to an unlearned reader of the Bible, would appear to have no bearing whatever upon the point at issue. During the great forty days after His resurrection, Christ appeared on ten different occasions. It was a time of the deepest

interest and importance. Everything that He then did and said had a more than ordinary significance. In reference to two of those occasions, St Paul informs us (1 Cor. xv. 7) that He was "seen of James" singly, "then of all the Apostles." And St Luke further mentions, that "He spake to them of the things concerning the kingdom of God;" *i.e.*, the Christian Church. Why was St James singled out, moreover, for this great distinction? why do we find him introduced in the history of the Acts, again and again, in such a way as to imply some marked pre-eminence even among the Apostles—a pre-eminence which is nowhere expressly notified or accounted for in the sacred text? The time will not suffer me to produce the passages (Acts xii. 17; xv. 13; xxi. 18. See also Gal. i. 19; ii. 9), though they are all interesting—the more interesting from their *incidental character*—and they admit of only one interpretation. Every reader of ecclesiastical history knows what that interpretation is. St James was appointed (not improbably by our Lord Himself before His ascension, but certainly by the Apostles soon after) Bishop of Jerusalem, the first bishop in the Christian Church.[1]

In the same manner we know from the New Testament, backed by abundant testimony from "ancient writers," that Timothy was appointed Bishop of Ephesus by St Paul. And it is out of deference to these facts, which no candid student of church history can any longer deny—it is, I say, out of deference to these undoubted facts that the eminent

[1] (*a*) See above, No. 4 of this series, pp. 171-187. Even so learned a divine as Dr Milligan has confounded *that* James with the son of Zebedee.—"Croall Lecture," p. 256.

writer to whom I have referred is led to argue that the form of Ministry which might "be well adapted to the state of society in *Jerusalem* or *Ephesus* in the year 63, may not be the best for Scotland in the year 1863." But what does this argument become worth, or how can it be able to stand for a moment in the face of the Divine injunctions that we are to "be all of one mind," and "to obey them that have the rule over us," when we know that *not only* at Jerusalem and at Ephesus (two places sufficiently different in their states of society, and in "the national diversities of character and history"), but in every place, *in every quarter of the globe*, with states of society differing in every degree, from the lowest depths of barbarism to the utmost height of civilisation—wherever the preaching of the Gospel led to the firm establishment of the Church—the same form of church government was introduced? From India to Spain, from Iceland to Ethiopia, there was no other.[1] Is not the finger of God to be seen and read in all this no less plainly and conclusively than in the writing of a text?

And to all this is to be added that we have no difficulty in assigning sufficient reasons[2] for the comparative absence in the New Testament of the same distinct and definite organisation:—

1. The building up of the threefold ministry must be a matter of time and growth.

2. In Jerusalem itself, and wherever Jews abounded, it was God's will that the elder dispensation and its rulers should not be violently interfered with, and

[1] (*a*) See below, No. 8 of this series.

[2] (*a*) See the reasons stated more fully in the next No. of this series.

that no overt attempt should be made to supersede them, till Christ Himself came, in the coming of the Roman army, and took away both their place and nation.[1] And almost all the New Testament was written and published to the world before this event occurred.

3. In Gentile lands, we learn from St Paul's Epistles, and from the Acts, and also from St Jude, and from St John in the Revelation to the Seven Churches, how difficult it was to provide against the intrusion of unsound teachers, and how necessary it would be, even during the Apostles' lifetime, to be cautious as to the character and fitness of those who were to be appointed to *preside permanently* over the government, the teaching, and the worship of the flocks who were to be folded as the depositaries of the Gospel in its earliest age.

But, after all, we may be told again, that questions like this of Church Government are of little or no account in comparison with the great and all-important end, which is, "belief of the truth, and sanctity of life." I have already shown how the argument to which your attention has been called affects one portion of this great end,—viz., *Belief of the truth.* And now, with reference to the other portion of it, let us ask ourselves, *What is sanctity of life?* Is it not (among other qualities) to be humble, to be sober, to be chaste, above all, to be loving and charitable? And can we be said, as a Christian people, to have attained these graces in such perfection under Presbyterianism, that we have reason to cling to it on that account? I should be glad,

[1] See above, No. 3, p. 133 *sqq.*

indeed, to be able to entertain such an opinion. But Presbyterians themselves of the highest authority forbid us so to do. Look to the report, published two years ago, of the Committee appointed by the General Assembly to inquire into the increase of immorality not in our large towns but in our rural districts. Look to the pastoral address issued by the Assembly itself in consequence of that report. Look, again, to the address of the respected Moderator of the Assembly delivered last year. What a melancholy tale do these documents unfold! And how has all this come upon us? Not certainly from any *want* of liberty to choose the particular form of Ministry, or even the individual Minister whom we "may think best for the culture of our religious nature," but, as I believe, from the *excess* of this liberty, which is condemned again and again in the Word of God, and which constitutes the sin of schism. And what limit can there be to this excess, if the sanction for it is to be sought not in the will of God, but in the wilfulness of man?

It is true that God in His mercy has made salvation to ourselves the great end of man; and yet there is an end greater still, viz., THE DIVINE GLORY. Moreover, we may rest assured, that our salvation will never be found in any course which is inconsistent with that greater end. And God has revealed to us in part how we are to seek His glory. He has taught us that He is a God of unity and love. Therefore, He has bidden us to be "all of one accord," that we may "with one mind and one mouth glorify" Him. For "He is not a God of confusion, but of peace, as in all the churches of the saints." (1 Cor. xiv. 33.)

And then when we are further told, and told truly, that the grand design of God by His Church is not only "to make men holy," but to "Christianise the world," remembering the pathetic prayer of Christ, that all His may be one, and the express design which He had in view in making that prayer, viz., "that the world might believe" in Him (John xvii. 21), we shall not suppose that this design can be successfully accomplished in any spirit of self-will.[1] And if, notwithstanding our present divisions, something (for which we have cause to thank God) is being effected towards that end, we cannot doubt that much more might be done, and much better might be done, if those divisions were removed, and the Heathen were to see that in bringing to them the Gospel of peace and love, we had first learned to practise more perfectly among ourselves the lessons which we have come to preach.

To sum up, then, what has now been said. We cannot admit that it is consistent with what we should expect either from the wisdom or the goodness of our Heavenly Father, or from the love and mercy of our Saviour Christ, *to require all Christians to be at one*, and yet *to provide no one system by which* (with the help of other provisions) *that end might be secured*. Rather, we must conclude, that God *in His goodness* would ordain that one form of polity which *in His wisdom* He would foreknow to be best for all countries and for all times. Even in civil government it has not yet been found that any system is to be expected upon earth better or more suited for all people, under all circumstances, than a well-regulated Monarchy;

(*a*) See below, Appendix, ch. 2.

still less, therefore, can it be thought strange that the same one, and one only, form should be divinely ordained by Christ for the government of His Church, designed as it was to be *Universal*, and designed also to be *One*. Nor can I doubt that the able and esteemed author to whom I have alluded would himself be among the first to admit the justice of these conclusions, were it not that, as our great poet has expressed it—

> "Men's judgments are
> A parcel of their fortunes, and things outward
> Do draw the inward quality after them."

He knows that God has commanded us to worship together, and to communicate together in all good works, especially in that highest act of worship which binds us most to our Saviour and to each other—the Sacrament of His own most blessed Body and Blood. And this, he also knows, a *religious instinct* forbids us to do, so long as we are separated under different forms of church government. He tells us that "it requires all the resources of learning, and all the subtlety and ingenuity of practical reasoners to extract from Scripture, with any show of plausibility, Episcopacy, or Presbytery, or Independency, or any one form of church government;" but I doubt not he is also aware that it is only through *setting at nought the universal practice of the Church for fifteen centuries, by an undue and excessive exercise of private judgment*—in other words, it is only through men's *not obeying them that had the rule over them* (mind, I do not say the lawless and usurped, but the lawful and legitimate rule)—it is only through *disobedience to this plain and imperative precept of Scripture*, that

occasion has been given for the requirement of all that learning, of all that subtlety and ingenuity.[1] At the same time that the "resources of learning" are necessary and indispensable for the due and sound interpretation of Scripture, we are taught expressly in the Scripture itself, where St Peter writes, that "they who are *unlearned* wrest the Scriptures unto their own destruction." (2 Peter iii. 16.)

Meanwhile, the argument against which these remarks have been directed, though in itself unsound, and, as I cannot but believe, derogatory to God's glory and injurious to the salvation of man, affords, nevertheless, I am truly thankful to say, a ground of *hope*. When it shall become known that Presbyterianism has ceased to claim the authority of God's Word for the divisions which it has unhappily caused in the Christian Church (I say it not vauntingly, or upbraidingly, neither do I forget the provocation too often given, or the zeal and good intention still more often manifested in its behalf); and when, moreover, it is found that the best and most esteemed ministers of that body have begun to contemplate as possible "a modification" of their system, both of worship and government, if such modification should appear to be required "by the progress of events, by advance in education, or by a change in civil, social, and domestic relations,"[2] surely we may trust that *many* will feel bound to surrender what they hold by the slight tenure, if it be so, of a mere human preference, out of deference to convictions founded upon the

[1] (*a*) Compare Hooker, "E.P." Book i. c. xvi. 5.

[2] (*a*) Dr Caird's Essay. See also Dr Bisset's Address, quoted in No. 6 of this series, p. 318.

acknowledgment of Divine authority. And more especially may we hope for this when such surrender would open up the way to all the blessings and benefits of practical intercommunion between the Church established in this country and the already united Church of England and Ireland, and of the greater portion of the dependencies of our empire, extended, by the singular grace and providence of God, throughout the world. It would, indeed, be a lamentable proof of the want of that charity which is a most essential part of true "sanctity of life"—the great end of our Christian profession—if, when we appeal to brethren in *such a cause* and on *such a plea*, the appeal were to be disregarded, and the acknowledged evils of our present separation allowed to continue without the remedy which brotherly love and co-operation would supply. For my own part, holding, as I do most firmly, the principle of a church establishment, and remembering that we are commanded in the New Testament to "submit ourselves to every (lawful) ordinance of man for the Lord's sake," I should feel bound to support the ecclesiastical system which is established in this country by the civil power, if I could do so without disregarding what I believe to be the more direct authority of God Himself; nor would I allow any mere personal predilection for our own ritual, or for our own form of church government, to prevent me from joining and supporting that system, if I felt that I could do it with God's permission.

The question to which these remarks have been directed leads me more than ever to feel and to express to you, my brethren, how heartily I could wish

that we were all as equal to the requirements of our position, as every day's experience may convince us of its great and growing importance. That we are, for the most part, miserably unequal to them, is not altogether owing to ourselves. Nor is it to be expected at the present day that any effort of mere reasoning, however sound and however unanswerable, will be able to accomplish much towards either removing obstacles or increasing for us the support and encouragement which we so greatly need. We are not indeed at liberty to decline the appeal to argument when it is forced upon us, or when occasion calls for it; and in the present instance *it has been forced upon us*, because, as not submitting ourselves to the church establishment of this country, we are placed in a sinful position by the conclusion (supposing it to be a sound one) which, while it sets us free from any direct ordinance of God, leaves us bound to the ordinance of man; a result which the author of the essay was not concerned with, and which at all events (I willingly believe, from kindly motives) he keeps out of view. But although it is incumbent upon us not to neglect such appeals, and although we may trust that God will bless the endeavour to meet them, provided it be made in a charitable and truth-loving spirit; there is—need I say? —another kind of argument which is far more likely to prevail with the generality of mankind, and which I would desire above all things to impress both upon myself and you,—I mean the argument which arises from the visible and acknowledged fact that we know our duty as the ministers of Christ, and that we endeavour faithfully and strenuously to perform it.

May God give us all grace to lay this consideration to heart, day by day, while we live here; so that when we shall be summoned to the great account, we may hear those blessed words addressed to each of us—"Well done, good and faithful servant, thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord!"

APPENDIX.

CHAPTER I.

HOOKER'S OPINION EXPLAINED AND VINDICATED.

I AM well aware that Hooker, in aiming to establish his grand argument in defence of the English Church, upon a basis of law which should be all-sufficient and co-extensive with the Puritan errors which he desired to refute, has been content to place the source of ecclesiastical power *originally* in the whole body of the Church, as of civil power in the whole body of the State, and that he has been much commended by modern authors of eminence (for instance, by Mr Hallam) for the liberality of his sentiments in this respect. But even in this view, which waives the express authority of Holy Scripture, and therewith all claim of Divine right for any one particular form of Church Polity, his statements, as based if it be so) only upon natural reason and historical records, are sufficient to secure all that we require. According to Mr Hallam, "it was maintained by this great writer not only that ritual observances are variable, but that *no certain form of Polity* is set down in Scripture as generally indispensable for a Christian Church."[1] And yet even in Hooker, of whom this may be said with apparent truth (upon the ground, especially, of a passage which Mr Hallam there quotes, and which occurs in Book iii. chap. x. 8 of the "Ecclesiastical Polity"[2]), we find such expressions of opinion as these :—

"What need we to seek far for proofs, that the Apostles, who began this order of regiment of Bishops, did it not but *by*

[1] Hallam's "Constitutional History," i. 294.

[2] But see that same, Book iii. chap. iv. and chap. xi. 20. "To the Apostles in the beginning, and to the Bishops *always since*, we find plainly, both in Scripture and in all Ecclesiastical records, other ministers of Word and Sacraments have been subordinate."

divine instinct, when without such direction, things of far less weight and moment they attempted not? . . . Before Timothy was employed in those Episcopal affairs of the Church, about which the Apostle St Paul used him, the Holy Ghost gave special charge for his Ordination, and prophetical intelligence more than once what success the same would have. And shall we think that *James was made Bishop of Jerusalem; Euodias, Bishop of the Church of Antioch;*[1] the *Angels in the Churches of Asia, Bishops;* that Bishops everywhere were appointed to take away factions, contentions, and schisms, without some divine instigation and direction of the Holy Ghost? *Let us not fear to be herein bold and peremptory, that if anything in the Church's government, surely the first institution of Bishops was from Heaven, was even of God; the Holy Ghost was the author of it.*"—Book vii. chap. v. 60.

Again: "That so the ancient Fathers did think of Episcopal Regiment, that they held this order as a thing *received from the Blessed Apostles themselves*, and *authorised even from Heaven*, we may, perhaps, more easily prove than obtain that they all shall grant it who see it proved."—*Ibid.* 3.[2]

And with regard to the whole of Hooker's argument in his third Book, and in particular, therefore, to the passage quoted by Mr Hallam, it must be borne in mind that in the seventh Book (from which both the foregoing extracts are taken) Hooker himself avows that *a change had taken place in his opinions upon this question*, in the interval, as we may suppose, since the four first Books were published.[3] His words are:—

"Now although we should leave *the general received persuasion held from the first beginning*, that the Apostles themselves left Bishops invested with power above other pastors; although, I say, we should give over this opinion, and embrace *that other conjecture* which so many have thought good to follow, and

[1] See Fynes Clinton's "Fasti Romani," ii. 535, who gives 43 A.D. as the probable date of Euodias' appointment as Bishop at Antioch.

[2] (*a*) See also the passages quoted in No. 4 of this series, p. 156, and No. 5, p. 238, note 1.

[3] The first four Books appeared in 1594, the fifth in 1597. The last three Books not till more than fifty years after the author's death, which took place in 1600.

which *myself did sometimes judge a great deal more probable than now I do*, namely, that after the Apostles were deceased, Churches did agree amongst themselves, for preservation of peace and order, to make one Presbyter in each chief over the rest, etc., etc. . . . this order, taken by the Church itself (for so let us *suppose* that the Apostles did neither by word nor deed appoint it), were, notwithstanding, more warrantable than that *it should give place and be abrogated*, because the Ministry of the Gospel and the functions thereof ought to be from Heaven."—Book vii. chap. xi. 8.

This, I say, supplies all that is required when it is pleaded (as I pleaded in my "Discourse on the Scottish Reformation," see No. 5 of this series), that in seeking to obtain peace and unity, the Episcopacy of Scotland should not be expected to "give place."

But further, in extenuation of this (lower, and, as I cannot but believe, less correct) view, as certainly entertained by many in Hooker's time, and, probably, by some of the Reformers previously, let me be allowed to quote the following remarks from the distinguished pen of the last editor of Hooker's works —remarks which, I am persuaded, are as just and true as they are charitable :—

"Should it be asked how such accomplished divines, as Jewel and others of his class undoubtedly were, could permit themselves, for any present benefit to the Church, so to waver in so capital a point, with the full evidence of antiquity before their eyes, it may be replied, first of all, that in some sort *they wanted that full evidence with which later generations have been favoured.* The works of the Fathers had not yet been critically sifted, so that in regard of almost every one of them men were more or less embarrassed, during the whole of that age, with vague *suspicions of interpolation.* The effect of this is apparent in various degrees throughout the controversies of the time ; but on no question would it be more felt than on this, of the Apostolical succession and the frame of the visible Church, because that was a subject on which, more continually perhaps than on any other, temptations to forgery had arisen ; and also because *the remains of St Ignatius*, in particular, for a single writer the most decisive of all who have borne witness

to Apostolical principles, *were all that time under a cloud of doubt*, which was providentially dispelled in the next age by the discovery of a copy unquestionably genuine.[1] This consideration, as it accounts (among other things) for the little stress which Hooker seems to lay on quotations from St Ignatius, to us most important and decisive, so it must in the nature of things have placed his predecessors, of whom we are now speaking, under a considerable disadvantage, as compared with the writers of the following century, and in all candour should be taken into account: on the one hand, by those who would take advantage of the silence of the Reformers to disparage the Apostolical succession; on the other hand, by the advocates of that doctrine, to prevent their judging too hardly of the Reformers themselves for their comparative omission of it."[2]

CHAPTER II.

DIVERSITY OF MINISTRY A HINDRANCE TO THE CONVERSION OF THE HEATHEN.

No one can deny the solemn responsibility which attaches to us all to propagate among the heathen, and, still more, to maintain in our own Colonial Dependencies, the pure gospel of Christ, upon Scriptural and Reformation principles, and to do both, as far as possible, in the true Christian spirit, not of jealousies and of divisions, but of Love and Unity. I can

[1] See above, No. 4 of this series, p. 189.

[2] Keble's "Preface to Hooker," i. 61. See also p. 77, where the same writer adds: "Hooker, in common with most of his contemporaries, shrunk from the legitimate result of his own premises, the rather, as the fulness of Apostolical authority on this point had *never come within his cognizance*, whereas the next generation of divines entered on the subject, as was before observed, *fresh from the discovery of the genuine remains of Ignatius*." Ignatius is reckoned by Fynes Clinton as succeeding Euodias in the see of Antioch about A.D. 70, that is, thirty years before the death of St John.

imagine few things more painful than when a *Scotchman* and an *Englishman*, who have gone forth as Missionaries from the same island, bearing with them, in some sort, the authority and the prestige of the same kingdom and nation, speaking the same tongue, carrying in their hands the same Bible, and professing to teach the same way of salvation, are called on (as must often be the case) to explain why it is, and how it is, that they who have come to teach others are not yet agreed among themselves as to the message which they have to deliver, or, at least, as to the circumstances under which it is their duty to deliver it—a non-agreement which, in the eyes of the unenlightened heathen, must be almost equally scandalous and embarrassing, whether it shall be represented to them as arising from matters of *great*, of *little*, or of *no* importance.

Upon this subject, however, I shall leave it altogether to others to speak, and especially to those who will be able to do so with most authority, as laying before us the results of actual experience.[1]

First, then, to give the testimony of the great Orientalist of the seventeenth century, Dr Edward Pocock:—"Upon this occasion, these two learned men (Pocock and Grotius) entered into a long discourse concerning the state of things in THE EAST, and the reasons why the holy Religion of Jesus Christ was so far from gaining ground in those countries that it was treated there by unbelievers with great contempt. Mr Pocock mentioned several things which he observed to be thus fatally mischievous; but amongst them all, he told him *there was nothing more so than the many schisms and divisions of those that own the name of Christ*, who ought to be 'as one fold under one Shepherd.'"—Twell's "Life of Pocock," p. 78.

There are some valuable remarks in the *Colonial Church Chronicle*, March 1857, pp. 98-100, by a writer who is evidently well acquainted with the present state of India, which shew that the evils of Religious Disunion there felt are only yet in their commencement, or rather are *held for the present*

[1] (*a*) In addition to the following testimonies collected five-and-twenty years ago, the reader may find others, of similar tendency and more recent date, in the Author's "Outlines of the Christian Ministry," pp. 255-61.

comparatively in suspense, because the various missionary Bodies, who are not in communion with each other, have hitherto been anxious to avoid collision, and there has been ample space, without mutual interference, for them all. What a melancholy consideration to think, as evangelization spreads throughout our great Eastern Empire—now become equally, as placed in the hands of our common Sovereign, the property both of Scotch and English—our "unhappy divisions" must grow more apparent and more baneful! What an appeal to all Christians at home to reconsider the grounds of their own position![1]

To pass from East to West, the following remarks, the result of many years' experience in the UNITED STATES AND CANADA, are full of salutary warning:—

"Consequences *pernicious and destructive even to the mother country*, result from the early neglect of its Colonial offspring. America exhibits, on a large scale, some remarkable effects consequent on *sectarian division*. Dissent has, in a fuller measure than in this country, worked out its legitimate results, and these results are *not* those which might be expected from the *Christianity of the Bible*. The first effect of religious division seems to be mutual animosity and bitterness, and a general breaking-up of what ought to be the harmonious structure of society. Different bodies become jealous of the influence of one another, and seek opportunities for diminishing that influence by various demoralizing contrivances. If these bodies are pretty equally represented or patronized in the Legislature, the Government, almost as a matter of course, will become first *impartial*, and secondly *indifferent*. The next effect will be an intolerant liberalism, first forbidding (when it has the power) the inculcation of doctrine in connection with Scripture, and next, when this prohibition has proved absurd, extending it to the Scriptures themselves: the public mind, at the same time, is undergoing a similar process; and men at length cease to quarrel about Religion, because little definite Religion remains to occasion animosity.

[1] See also *Colonial Church Chronicle* for February 1861—"On Presbyterianism in India," p. 46.

"But where is the cure to be found which can reach the source of this extensive and spreading malady?

"It appears that to give the Scriptures their proper place in the Christian scheme, and thereby to make them effectual to the promotion of liberty, we must connect them with the Doctrine and the Authority which existed at the time of their first promulgation. When this is accomplished, the Bible will not be overshadowed either by Roman additions to the faith, or by the equally injurious devices of modern Sectarian Theology. Now it is a fact that the Reformed Church in England and in America retains an embodiment of the *doctrine* of the primitive Church in its Creeds and in its Liturgies. It is also a fact that it possesses the *authority* of the Early Church conveyed from Christ through the imposition of hands. It is unnecessary to trace the steps of this succession, since it is enough to show that from the time of the Apostles there have always been Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and that Consecration and Ordination have been, as a matter of history, constantly practised. As our descent from Adam is proved by the unvarying law of parentage, so in like manner, the constant regulations of the Church demonstrate our ecclesiastical descent from, and our connection with, those who were commissioned to teach *all nations to the end of the world.*

"It would seem, therefore, that so far as the Church acts in her original character, so far she fulfills the office of maintaining the Scriptures in their true position. And in proportion as she extends herself upon her Apostolic foundations, she more manifestly becomes *a centre of Unity* for the scattered sheep of Christ."—Caswall's "American Church," p. 383, *seq.*, 387, *seq.*

In connection with this extract, it must be surely a matter of interest to all Scotchmen that the Church of the United States, which is in Communion with the Church of England, derived the first germ of its now widely-diffused and numerous Episcopate from the Bishops of this country in 1784.

The only complete History which we have of the Colonial Church thus draws our attention to one source of the evils in question, as they have existed, and unhappily still exist, not only in America, but *throughout the world*:—

"It is obvious that the removal of the Episcopal Church in Scotland from the position which she once occupied in that country,—a position identical with that occupied by the National Church of our own,—and her depressed condition for nearly the whole of the last century, must have acted as a *sore discouragement and hindrance to the Church of England, in every foreign and domestic work throughout the same period.* It was not merely the withdrawal from her channels of usefulness of a large portion of the vigorous intellect and sturdy diligence and fervid piety which have ever been the heritage of the Scottish people; but the renewal also, and often with increased strength, of the *self-same evils abroad* which have acted with such destructive force at home. The importance of these facts, and the little regard paid to them in many quarters, have led me to direct attention to them."—Anderson's "History of the Colonial Church," ii. 536.

Passing now from America to AFRICA, it appears that our colonists in the South are placed at disadvantage in comparison with the Dutch, on account of Religious Disunion.

"I was glad, however, to balance this seeming disparagement of Christianity or missionary zeal among the Dutch, by pointing out to my Companions, what has apparently not struck them before, that the Dutch Church, by its *unity*, was able to promote the social well-being of the country in founding new towns, which *an English population of five times the amount cannot do*, and seem in this land rarely to attempt, without a forced military expenditure, calling into activity most of the elements of which a town is constituted. To this latter cause King William's Town, Fort Beaufort, and Fort Peddie (the last two proclaiming their birth by the appendage of 'Fort' to each of them), and, in no small degree, Grahamstown itself, are indebted for their existence. Whereas the Dutch can point in the same brief space of time to the rise of Burghersdorp, Humansdorp, Colesberg, Bloemfontein, besides Riversdale in the west, and perhaps to many other places, whose origin, and growth into a town or village, is *entirely* owing to the *one Dutch Church* to which all Dutchmen resort, and near to which aged Boers like to settle, without having their attention and their alms alike distracted, by *maintaining several*

religious bodies as we English needs must do, even in such towns as Uitenhage, Somerset, and Cradock, where the Dutch Church still forms the principal religious feature of the place.

"Would that the idea of the value of Unity in religious matters, could by any arguments, secular or spiritual, be forced upon the minds of our countrymen!"—Merriman's "Journal," p. 166, *seq.*

"Here is another instance of what I have remarked upon before, this superiority of the Dutch to ourselves, in one at least of the great functions of our social and civilised life, viz., the founding of towns *arising entirely from the strength and unity of their Church.* Ten times the number of English, *in consequence of their religious divisions*, could not do what the Dutch so easily achieve."—*Ibid.* p. 178.

The interesting Memoir of the late lamented Bishop Armstrong supplies the following observation, applicable to the same region :—

"As I approached the town, I could not but be saddened by the thought of our religious divisions. No less than three places of worship were visible, besides the Church of England. *This, in the midst of a population of some* 700 *people, was indeed a melancholy spectacle.* What a waste of men, of zeal, of means for their support, when this 700 is split up into four divisions, each division requiring its own teacher! One earnest, faithful pastor might easily supply all the wants of the place."—Carter's "Life of Bishop Armstrong," p. 347.

In regard to AUSTRALASIA, it will be universally admitted that we could not produce a witness more entitled to be heard than Bishop Selwyn. In the sermons which he preached before the University of Cambridge, when he was in England in 1854, that Apostolic Missionary delivered the following testimony concerning the evils of Disunion in general, and especially those of which he himself was cognisant in the EXTREME SOUTH :—

"I leave it to you to judge of the effects of divisions here at home. Some may think that zeal is quickened, and that therefore good is done, by the rivalry of religious opinions; and they quote that passage in the Epistle to the Philippians, where St Paul rejoices, that in *every* way Christ is preached. But

though St Paul there rejoices that Christ is preached, even though it were 'of envy and strife,' 'of contention,' and 'in *pretence*'—must we not believe that he would have rejoiced infinitely more if he could have seen all men agreeing to preach Christ 'of goodwill,' and 'of love,' 'sincerely,' and 'in truth'? It is one thing to rejoice in the overruling Providence of God, which brings good out of evil; and it is another and a widely different thing to *acquiesce in the evil*, because by God's Providence it has been made the means of good. The same Lord, who prayed that 'all might be one,' foretold that His Gospel should 'not bring peace on earth, but rather division.' And yet there is no one of us who doubts on which side is the mind of Christ, or whether His example points to peace or to division, to the olive branch or to the sword? Perhaps even on this lower ground of practice and experience, if we were to go below the surface, we should find *a vast amount of unsuspected evil, resulting directly from the speculative and controversial manner in which Religion is taught.* If it could be proved that the crowded congregations of our Churches and Chapels of all religious persuasions, represent fairly and fully the state of religion in the mass of the people, we might then rejoice with St Paul, even in the midst of much strife and contention, that in any way Christ is preached. But if we have reason to suspect, or rather to *know*, that under this fair and visible surface of Religion, agitated indeed by waves but sparkling with sunbeams from Heaven, there lies *a dark and stagnant and unfathomable depth of Infidelity*—millions who believe nothing—and if we have reason to think that their *Unbelief* is caused by our *Divisions*, and that they would have been brought home to *Christ* if they had seen us more loving and united in ourselves, then indeed, if this be so, we may well tremble, lest these controversies which we excuse *as incentives to zeal* should be found to have been stumbling-blocks to our Brethren, and *we the men by whom the offence came.* I speak, of course, with diffidence of anything that relates to the state of religion in England, but *I am bold to speak of that which I have heard and seen in the Mission field.* There, I assert, without fear of contradiction, *schism is looked upon as an acknowledged evil.* There may be the utmost Charity and brotherly kindness

among the Missionaries themselves; but that is not enough: no inward and spiritual unity can act as an *outward evidence;* the keen-sighted native Convert soon detects a difference of system, and thus Religion brings Disunion instead of Harmony and Peace."—Bishop of New Zealand's "Four Sermons," p. 59, *seq.*

As an echo to the foregoing, the following from the EXTREME NORTH was received in a letter written by the first Bishop of British Columbia six months ago, July 1860:—

"I was present at a meeting at the latter place (Yale) on my way, when an address was presented to me, and the Chairman, *an American and Presbyterian*, called upon all present in this new land to forget the past differences, and to adopt the Church of England for their religion, as a Church in which they could have confidence, which *had a broad basis*, and which was at work among them."—See *English Churchman*, No. 939, p. 1259.

To return once more to THE EAST, I venture, in conclusion, to submit to the Reader two passages from Dr Wolff's Travels to Bokhara:—

"I may say, without fear of any imputation of vanity, that I have now seen and made myself acquainted with all the branches of the Catholic Church, and with all the sects now existing on earth; and I have not shunned to sit at the feet of the Bishops in the Roman Catholic Church, in the Armenian Church, in the Greek Church, in the Chaldean and Abyssinian Church, with Wesleyans, Independents, and learned Baptists; and the result of my investigations is, that *the Church of England is the pearl of price and jewel of the earth*, and the mightiest masterpiece of Bible illustration, which the world has witnessed since it fell under the yoke of sin."—Vol. i. p. 67, *seq.*

And yet the author of this statement is no enemy to Presbyterianism:—

"I am always rejoiced to learn that Episcopalians send out Missionaries, but in the meantime, as long as this is not done, the state of the Eastern Churches is in such a sad condition, that *modest*, *prudent*, and *zealous* Presbyterians might be rendered useful to them; and these very Presbyterian Mis-

sionaries would perceive, *from the state of the East*, that *Episcopacy is a primitive condition of the Church*, and Congregationalism an anomaly. And thus, while it cannot be denied that they enlighten the East, it will also follow that they take back with them to their own country a portion of its light, to the benefit of the country from which they were sent forth."—*Ibid.* p. 189.

I have added this last quotation for the information of those who imagine that Episcopacy is not, and has not been from the beginning, as universal throughout the East (without any alliance with, but rather in the most determined opposition to, Popery) as it has been, and still is, for the most part, throughout Western Christendom.

The foregoing collection made five-and-twenty years ago cannot be better closed than by the following passage from Dr Milligan's valuable "Croall Lecture" on the Resurrection of our Lord, 1881 :—

"Neither words about the beauty of Unity, nor the fact of an invisible unity avail to help. What the Church ought to possess is a Unity that the eye can see. If she is to be a witness to her Risen Lord, she must do more than talk of Unity, more than console herself with the hope that the world will not forget the invisible bond by which it is pled that all her members are bound together into one. Visible unity in one form or another is an essential mark of her faithfulness. . . . The world will never be converted by a disunited Church."—P. 201.

POSTSCRIPT.

In the introduction to this number I have spoken of the interest excited by the foregoing Address as shown by correspondence in the public journals; and it occurs to me that it may be worth while to produce some evidence of that fact, in order partly to illustrate the historical character of these "Appeals," and partly to convince my readers that if, in pursuing the object which I had taken up from the commencement of my Episcopate, I had often to encounter unpleasant and undeserved censure, I was not without very kind and cordial encouragement (from various quarters competent to give substantial testimony) to induce me to persevere. The following are extracts from a few only of the letters which I received at the time. I could have wished that it had been possible to suppress the epithets and terms of praise (often, it will be felt, enthusiastic and extravagant) without detracting from the vivid reality of the representation, which the passages, taken as a whole, will be found to convey.

1. From the late Bishop Ewing of Argyle and the Isles :—

September 1863 (no day or place).—"You have touched a rock, and the water begins to flow out. We know not what we are come here for, nor what our greatest work is to be; but it seems now to me, as if this had been that for which God raised you up—the gathering together into one of those here so long divided. It will require great patience and great trust; but *it will come;* and now even it throws into shade all our little jobs about offices and usages, and what have so long (too long) been the characteristics of Scotch Episcopacy."

From the same :—

Dysart House (without date, but later in that year).—"I think that it would be well to make a pamphlet or little tract of the letters which have appeared in the *Scotsman* on both sides, for gratuitous circulation and criticism in the newspapers, now that the correspondence has ceased. . . . I would gladly pay £2 towards the publication."

From THE SAME :—

Lochgilphead, October 29 (same year).—"I saw Sir John Maxwell of Polloc,* and he will be very glad to see you, and me, and any ministers we can collect, to talk over the matter of an Union of the Established Church of this country and that of England, including ourselves. I enclose a letter from the Duke here, who is a man of weight in such matters, but of course he is at first averse to the idea ; and he does not know that some of us, at any rate, are ready to recognise the existing Incumbents in Scotland as *de facto* clergy. This, I believe, will be the turning point with many. The Establishment here is in a very shaky state, and I expect the end will be no Established Church in Scotland or in Ireland. Still we are wise to do what we can to maintain *the principle* in Scotland in the only way I think it now can be maintained, viz., some sort of connection with the Established Church of England. I do not think they will come to us here from any felt or avowed deficiencies of their own system, but only from feeling after and requiring some higher and stronger and more pleasing thing than they now have to hold on by."

To that letter I wrote (*Nov.* 2) a long answer, which was intended as a reply to the Duke of Argyll, and was forwarded to him, but with no satisfactory result on his Grace's part. I quote the conclusion as bearing upon the general subject of these extracts : —"I have received so many assurances from different quarters respecting the interest already felt in favour of 'the movement,' that I am not altogether without hope of its bringing forth, in God's good time, and with His blessing, some substantial fruit. On the last railway journey which I made, a week ago, a Perthshire (Presbyterian) laird, whom I scarcely knew, introduced the subject, spoke of the proposal as one with which he heartily sympathized, and added, 'few people are aware of the extent to which it has taken hold of the minds of all classes throughout the country.'"

2. From A CLERGYMAN OF THE DIOCESE OF ST ANDREWS,

* In a previous letter, dated from the house of his friend Mr Erskine of Linlathen, the Bishop had written :—"I am sure that Sir John Maxwell would like such a meeting at his house ; that it would fulfil all his and his late wife's ideas of Union in a practical way."

a Scot born and bred, now holding an important charge in another Diocese :—

Sept. 24, 1863.—"In common with all of my Brethren, I have watched with much interest the remarkable effects produced by your Lordship's last charge upon the public mind, and fervently trust that a brighter and a better day is now beginning to dawn upon Scotland. The very fact of the appearance of such letters as have recently filled the columns of *The Scotsman* and *The Courant* is one of which the importance can hardly be over-estimated. But even that does not show the full extent of the influence of your Lordship's charge, and, I may add, of your previous labours for the great and sacred cause of Unity. Presbyterianism is stirred to an extent that some of its upholders would scarcely be willing to admit. Even in our quiet corner [East of Fife] much discussion has been going on with regard to Episcopacy and Presbyterianism. In fact, I never go anywhere without having to talk over and discuss the matter—a thing which I confess I do not much relish, as I never see much good come of it. I always recommend my friends to *read* rather than to *argue*, as one is too apt to fight for Victory rather than Truth, and to become an Advocate rather than a Judge. At times of course we must argue, and recently I have been compelled to fight a good deal. Most of my opponents frankly admit their ignorance of the whole question, but *nevertheless* (or rather, shall I say? *because* of their ignorance) stoutly refuse to admit anything savouring of an historical character as evidence of the truth of Episcopacy . . . . Knowing, as I well do, the depth and intensity of a Scotsman's prejudices, I can scarcely dare to hope that many will be persuaded at the present time. But I am also firmly persuaded that the work, which your Lordship has been the honoured instrument of inaugurating, will, by God's help, go on and prosper, until once more, as in days of old, we shall have, to quote Coxe's[1] words :—

> "One Church, one Creed in Scotland
> From Caithness to Dunblane."

[1] From "Christian Ballads." Their Author is now Bishop of Western New York.

And whatever may be the result of the present movement, your Lordship cannot fail to find in it much cause for pleasure and satisfaction, much also for gratitude to God. And I must add that in striving, as you have done, to promote the union of the scattered bodies of Christians in this kingdom, you have added another to the many benefits conferred by you on Scotland—benefits of which I firmly believe our posterity will reap the advantage; benefits whose full value will only, I fear, be seen and appreciated in another age."

It may be proper to add that the writer of that letter had formerly been one of my pupils, as a theological student, at Glenalmond.

3. From a Clergyman of the Diocese of St Andrew's, a Scot born and bred, now deceased:—

Sept. 25, 1863.—"I cannot tell how much I rejoice at your having been enabled at the present time to get in the thin edge of the wedge. It is so difficult to get a hearing on such a matter. I hope you will go on with your letters. You may rest assured they are attracting attention. My father [a layman] is quite *excited* about them. Dr —— [a layman], formerly a loose enough Churchman, thinks your Charge a grand production, and lent *The Scotsman* containing it to Lady —— who, he thought, wanted enlightenment! Young Free Church doctors have been dipping into it. One of them told me he thought it *very intolerant*, but I made him confess he had only glanced at it, and he promised to read it again. In fact everybody here [Forfarshire] is reading it, and, what is more, talking about it.

"Who would have looked for all this newspaper correspondence when you first made your assault ten years ago? Enough has been already accomplished to show that you were not—as many said—a mere visionary. And I, for one, believe that there is a great deal of work yet in store for you in Scotland. I have heard people confess that much more has followed your initiatory movement than they could possibly have conceived."

4. From a Clergyman in the Diocese of Glasgow:—

September 26, 1863. "I do not often see *The Courant*, but I have had the pleasure of reading your admirable letter in yesterday's paper. Will you allow me to suggest that that

letter would make a most excellent tract to put into the hands of Presbyterians? And will you permit me to request your Lordship to publish it in a cheap form for general distribution?"

5. From the late MAJOR SCOTT OF GALA:—

September 26, 1863.—"I have been reading your Lordship's letters with great delight. They are having a great effect upon the country. The boldness of your line is certain ultimately to carry the country with you. I hope you will answer the last letter in *The Courant*, which is the ablest yet written on the other side." [This was done.]

6. From A PARISH MINISTER (personally unknown to me), now deceased:—

September 24, 1863.—"In compliance with your Lordship's request in *The Scotsman* of yesterday, I write as the author of the letters signed 'A Parish Minister.' . . . I wrote the letters in *The Scotsman*, after reading your Lordship's Charge, under an imperious sense of duty, the result of several years' reflection on the distinctive differences between our respective Churches. I was led into this course of study soon after my settlement in this parish. I began to feel how feeble the so-called 'Evangelical' principles, in which I had been brought up, were as a basis for ministerial teaching and personal faith. I saw that in St Paul's Epistles no lines were drawn between different members of the Church, but that all baptized were addressed as members of an actual kingdom, heirs of God, and therefore responsible for the use of their calling. This I saw at once to be directly the reverse of the 'Evangelical' theory (where men are treated as aliens from God till their conversion), and in harmony with the whole position of the English Church as laid down in her Baptismal service and Catechism. This led me to study her services and constitution with greater attention, while the duty of conducting Presbyterian service made me feel how needful a Liturgy is for both pastor and people. If I had attained to these views before my Ordination here, I should unquestionably have sought for Anglican Orders; but as it is, I felt it my duty to write the letters to *The Scotsman* to suggest a movement which seems so necessary for the religious welfare of Scotland. Tendencies in this direction no doubt exist largely

in our Church, but they are widely scattered, and without any centre to rally round. I hope that the present discussion in *The Scotsman* may pave the way for some well defined course of action."

From THE SAME :—

October 5.—"The political aspect of the question is one of the utmost importance: and I feel it difficult to understand the extreme apathy of Parliament to Scotch ecclesiastical affairs, contrasted with continual efforts to 'liberalize' the English Church —already so much wider than any Church in Christendom."

The following extract from the same letter affords a practical illustration of the truth of the remark made in my "Introduction" to No. 4, p. 163 *sq.*, with reference to the effects produced by the promises required from Presbyterian ministers at their Ordination, as tending to stifle honest convictions, and so to prejudice the cause of Truth in regard to the controversy between Presbytery and Episcopacy. The Rev. John Smith, of Ecclesmachan, had written to *The Scotsman* a letter in which he condemned "A Parish Minister" (my correspondent) for having given so much encouragement to my proposals.

"I regret much having spoken slightingly of Mr Smith's etter, but *I felt irritated at his charge of breaking my Ordination vows*. I have written again to *The Scotsman* on this point; but your Lordship's suggestion to get our preliminary questions [at Ordination] modified[1] is extremely valuable. As it is, they seem to exact impossibilities; and they are, I believe, merely Assembly Regulations and totally unwarranted by any Act of Parliament."

From THE SAME :—

November 11, 1863.—"I have to acknowledge, with many thanks, the receipt of your Lordship's 'Discourse on the Reformation' [2nd edit.], which I hope may have a wide circulation in its new form. . . . I had yesterday a letter from a friend in India—a Church of Scotland chaplain —complaining bitterly of *the weakness produced there by our divisions*, and longing earnestly for a United Church. He writes in ignorance of the recent correspondence. The follow-

[1] See above, Introduction to No. 4, pp. 161, *seq.*

ing is part of his letter:—'I am not prepared with my present light to submit to be reordained, but whatever length I might go, it is, I fear, quite certain that Union is now, and must always remain, hopeless, if Reordination is to be absolutely insisted on. If care is taken to make the succession certain as regards the new Bishops, the thing will come entirely right in half a century. If Episcopalians will not yield to this extent, there is nothing for it but an abolition of the State Church in Scotland, drawing with it as a necessary, if not immediate consequence, that of the Church of England.' Were the duty of a visible unity recognised, we might consider the question settled. It would soon, I think, be seen that Episcopacy has been *historically* justified as the bond of this Unity."

From THE SAME:—

November 23, 1863 (after he had seen a copy of my letter to Bishop Ewing, referred to above, p. 379).—"It is long since I read the Duke of Argyll's 'Essay,' but I distinctly recollect that he advocates the introduction of Liturgies, and of the Christian Year (at least of the leading festivals), and other distinctive features of Anglican worship. Yet these are the points at which the people would take more immediate offence than at the Episcopate. For Presbyterianism as a system of government I am convinced our middle and lower classes care nothing, and in this quarter at least [S.E. of Scotland] are totally indifferent."

7. From AN INDIAN CHAPLAIN OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH, personally unknown to me. The writer had not seen my Synodal Address for 1863; but a copy of my "Discourse on the Scottish Reformation" which had been republished earlier in that year, and which bore the title of "A United Church for the United Kingdom," had, it appears, been sent out to him, and the letter which I received from him in consequence furnishes extracts, which may be here introduced as bearing fully upon the matter which I am now illustrating.

Bombay, October 7, 1863.—"A friend did me the kindness to send by the last mail a copy of your 'Discourse on a United Church of Scotland, England, and Ireland,' which I have read

with very great pleasure ; and I trust you will pardon me as a stranger for expressing in this form my earnest hope that what you have suggested may be brought to pass. Speaking for myself, and I believe also for many of the younger ministers of the Church of Scotland, I can truly say that the feelings which you have expressed meet with a very hearty response. The first step towards Unity being once taken, I should confidently anticipate the warm support of the great mass of educated and thoughtful men throughout the country. . . . There is one point in particular as to which a satisfactory answer on the part of Episcopalians would be of the greatest service in assisting Presbyterians to see their way to a Union. What view do Episcopalians well read in the history of the Church of Scotland take of her Orders? I know well enough what men having no knowledge of the subject think, and do not hesitate to express ; but I cannot bring myself to believe that these opinions are acquiesced in by competent authorities. In the event of a Union would it be made a necessary condition that all clergymen of the existing Church of Scotland should receive Episcopal Ordination? If so, it is clear that Union is quite hopeless. But why should Reordination be insisted on? Even if it is capable of proof that there is any break in the succession of the Church of Scotland more serious than any others existing in the chain up to the time of the Apostles, the fact of admitting these, as a matter of compromise—if such a word be admissible—would in no degree affect the after-succession, provided that the Ordination of Bishops in the reconstructed church was in all respects perfectly regular; whilst it could be open to laymen who attach special weight to such matters, to receive the Sacraments only at the hands of those whose succession appeared to them indisputable. In this way the orders of the existing Church of Scotland might be respected, and the organization of the reconstructed Church be, within fifty years or so, complete in the eyes of those who attach the greatest weight to the succession. At the same time it might be left open perhaps to any to be reordained according to the forms of the new church."

It will be seen from what follows in the next page that I

had already, in correspondence with another quarter, given an answer to the foregoing enquiry.

8 From the late Mr JAMES HANNAY, then Editor of *The Courant* (E.C. Presbyterian layman). He had been travelling in Holland for his summer Holiday, and *The Courant* had contained some very interesting articles from his pen, in which, *inter alia*, he had described the utterly unsettled state of religious belief, arising out of the various ecclesiastical divisions, in that country.

September 14, *Edinburgh.*—"Holland still holds a respectable place in scholarship, and this tells favourably on their clergy, who are, beyond doubt, superior to ours in every kind of attainment. But I have not the least exaggerated in what I have said about the prevailing Rationalism, which, however, is preferable to stagnant ignorance, and local bigotry, of which we have so much here.

"In discussing your recent Charge with one of the clergy of the Established Church, I found that the *abstract notion* of a Union with England is not *primâ facie* disliked. But the clergy ask themselves what you would say to their Orders."

To that I replied:—*September* 16.—"You are quite right in suggesting that the real difficulty lies in the question of Orders. For my own part, I should be inclined to insist upon Episcopal Ordination (as being at least *more regular*[1]) *only* for the future, or prospectively; leaving it to the option of the existing generation of ministers to receive it or not, or to receive it *hypothetically*. . . . But of course ministers who are to be advanced to the Order of Bishops must receive Consecration; and to this I imagine no one would object. The essense of our system, as regards the ministry, is that we have a threefold Ordination – (1) of Deacons, (2) of Priests, (3) of Bishops, with *increase* of solemnity, and of *power* committed, and (as we trust) of *grace* received, at each successive step. The two former steps are commonly called 'Ordination,' and the last 'Consecration;' but either name might have been used with equal propriety, *quoad sensum*, for all three. I fear that Presbyterian ministers have never been in the habit of looking at the question from

[1] See my Charge for last year, "Non-Episcopal Ordination fairly considered."

this point of view; but when they begin to do so, I am sure it must approve itself to every reverent and humble mind. To rush at once to the highest office was not allowed even among the heathen. There were degrees of ministerial initiation in the Mysteries of Greece, and there was a Pontifex Maximus at Rome. And it is the same even among the Free Masons! In all nature and in human society we find the principle of gradation. Why not also in the offices of religion?"

From THE SAME :—

Edinburgh, September 18.—"'Rusticus' [an anonymous correspondent who had attacked my charge in *The Courant*] is not a foeman worthy of your steel; but as the subject of Episcopacy and Presbyterianism has been so much discussed lately, a letter of yours might do good by making the foundations of Episcopacy more popularly known. Besides, you always write in a conciliatory spirit, and it must be admitted that our Presbyterian clergy have not been always treated in that way. . . . I myself think that the question of Union may be discussed with great profit."

From THE SAME :—

Edinburgh, October 3.—"You can give a rejoinder to the new outburst of your foes, on Tuesday or so, if they seem to deserve it. I think myself that you are altogether master of the field, as against these controversialists."

From THE SAME :—

Edinburgh, October 22.—"I am anxious to close the correspondence before the discussion is embittered by the apprehensions of such people as the *Elder*, whose letter appears this morning. Would this be agreeable to yourself? At all events, you have set going an amount of speculation on the subject which will extend itself through society, and familiarise people with your favourite idea—probably to have important results at some future time."

From THE SAME :—

Edinburgh, October 26.—"I am confirmed in my opinion that it is as well we have discontinued the discussion for the present. You have at least had the advantage of reviving a side of the historical question which has been long overlooked, and the progress of any such great scheme as you have in view is necessarily slow."

INTRODUCTION.

THE public interest excited by my Synodal Address of 1863, reprinted as the preceding number of this series, was certainly not diminished by the appearance of its successor in 1864, which forms the present number. This was shown not only, as before, by correspondence in the public journals, but by leading articles on the subject, some of which are quoted on a foregoing page. And the opinions expressed appeared to be upon the whole so encouraging that the editor of *The Scottish Guardian* thought it worth while to reproduce a collection of them in his issue for November of that year, under the title of "The Press and Bishop Wordsworth's Charge," and also to write an article concerning them, which appeared in the number for January 1865.

But if the encouragement publicly given by the reception of that Address was greater than I had looked for, there was also discouragement from another quarter, which, trusting to the assurances by which I had been led to write and publish it, I did not expect. The Moderator of the General Assembly (Dr Pirie, late Principal of the University of Aberdeen), in his closing Address, had expressly invited all those who were separated from the Established

Church to come forward and state the grounds of their separation, with the view and in the hope that such communications (which, it was promised, should be received and considered with all candour and good faith), might lead to reconciliation. There was no response made, so far as I remember, by any other Ecclesiastical Body; but to me the opportunity appeared to be of such a kind, that, if neglected, it would place us in the wrong; and accordingly, as the reader will see from the following Address, I set myself to comply with the Moderator's invitation in the same good earnest in which, I did not doubt, it was intended to be given.

I have no wish to cast any undue blame upon the eminent and much respected individual (recently deceased) who was the cause of my disappointment. It is a manifest defect of the Presbyterian system that it has no permanent official, or body of officials, who would seem to be competent to take action in such circumstances (as, for instance, our Episcopal Synod would be competent to do); and the fault, if there was one, may be said, perhaps, to have consisted rather in a Moderator taking upon himself to offer such a public and solemn invitation, than in not attempting to give effect to it when it had been accepted. As it was, in my Synodal Address for the following year (1869), I had occasion to complain—speaking more particularly of that portion of my "Response" which contained the Scriptural argument—that "no attempt had been made to grapple with it, either in the authoritative quarter which had appeared to me to challenge its production, or in any other." It is true that in the spring of the

following year, *seven months after my Address had been delivered*, I received from Dr Pirie (with whom I had not then the pleasure of personal acquaintance) a private note informing me that he had sent to a newspaper, *The Edinburgh Courant*, a letter in which he had acknowledged, and taken some notice of my Address. But the notice, such as it was, could not be said in any sense to be an answer to my arguments. A correspondence ensued, including a second letter from Dr Pirie, and two on my side (all which may be seen reprinted from *The Courant*, in *The Scottish Guardian* for June and August, 1865), but with no satisfactory result. Happily, however, though unproductive apparently of any real fruit, it was so conducted that the remembrance of it did not prevent friendly relations from springing up between us when we became personally acquainted twenty years afterwards.

Besides appearing at the time fully reported in *The Scottish Guardian* for October 1864, and more or less in several of the public journals, the following Address was republished, and widely circulated, in 1866 (under the title of "The Principles of Episcopalians as a Basis of Christian Union," with an appendix (1.) "On the Ministerial Offices, &c., more or less extraordinary, mentioned in St Paul's Epistles;" and (2.) "On the Nomenclature of the Orders of the Threefold Ministry as used in the New Testament and in the earliest Fathers of the Church"), at the expense and through the zeal of the late Major Scott of Gala, to whom a tribute of grateful and affectionate remembrance for this and other more important and more lasting services to

our Church is justly due. It may also interest the reader to know that a large portion of the same address—*viz.*, that which relates to the argument from Holy Scripture—was so much approved by the late Bishop of Llandaff (the learned and highly esteemed Dr Oliphant), that he asked my permission to procure the translation of it into Welsh ; and that this was done under his direction, and with the help of another Welsh Bishop, by the *Society for promoting Christian Knowledge.*

CHARLES WORDSWORTH,
Bishop of St Andrews.

April 24, 1886.

RESPONSE OF EPISCOPALIANS.

BRETHREN OF THE CLERGY AND OF THE LAITY, —The public reception given to the Charge which I delivered last year, and the unusual attention which it met with from many of our fellow-Christians in this country, encourage me to resume the important subject upon which I then addressed you, in the hope that its renewed discussion may lead, by God's help, to a better understanding of the main points of difference which at present separate us from our Presbyterian brethren, and in course of time, if it please God, to the removal of those differences. And I am the more emboldened to take this course, because in the advertisement prefixed to the closing address delivered by the respected Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland for the present year, and since published by his authority, the writer, Dr Pirie, expressly invites "other denominations or parties to indicate any particulars as to which we," he says, "may misapprehend their views." He considers that "the demi-official character" of his own address affords a favourable opportunity for any who, in such circumstances, are disposed to avail themselves of it. Moreover, he adds, "I have long been convinced that *most of our differences arise from misconception, and that mutual explanations therefore, tendered*

in a fair and friendly spirit, would do much to reconcile, at all events, professing Christians among one another." Such sentiments coming from such a quarter are entitled to a response; and in undertaking to offer one I shall be careful, I trust, to say nothing except in that "fair and friendly spirit" which Dr Pirie, having himself set an example of it, has acquired the best possible right to prescribe to others. And further, I would venture to express a hope that if a discussion thus commenced upon both sides under solemn auspices is afterwards to pass into the hands of correspondents in the public newspapers, no advantage will be taken of anonymous writing to pronounce harshly or hastily upon questions in which the interests of our Redeemer's kingdom, not only in this land, but even to the uttermost parts of the earth, are so deeply and intimately involved.

I will begin by laying before you what the Moderator has said with reference to ourselves. Having spoken of the religious bodies who object on principle to the union of Church and State in any form, and having met the arguments upon which he supposes them to depend, by reasoning with which I entirely sympathize and substantially agree, he thus proceeds:—"But besides those . . . there are others that rest their opposition on altogether different grounds. Of these, some deny that Presbyterianism can be entitled to the character of a Church at all. They think that a true Church must have office-bearers with the names of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. They do not seem to consider it of any importance that even in the Churches which have

given those names to their office-bearers, the powers and duties of each have been altogether different in different countries and in different ages. They admit, indeed, that holiness is necessary to salvation, and that even faith is necessary, in so far as it may be a means of generating holiness; but they either hold that such a faith cannot be realized except in a Church governed by persons called Bishops, or, if it be, that it is not available, or at least equally available, for salvation. Now, while we prefer Presbyterianism as not only 'founded on the Word of God, and agreeable thereto,' but as to our minds the system of church government nearest the scriptural model, so far as Scripture enables us to form any definite conclusions on the subject, and certainly the most suitable for ourselves, we yet by no means presume to condemn the forms of other Churches. Forms of government we hold to be only means towards the attainment of an end. As monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy are severally suited for the peculiar condition and progress of different nations in civil government, so different forms of church government may in like manner be suited for nations placed in different circumstances, for the more effective promotion of the sole object which such government has in view. We hold, in a word, that to be the best form of church government which makes men the best Christians. To put the means on the same footing as the end, and to assume that the Supreme Being loves not faith and holiness for their own sakes, but only faith and holiness developed under a special organization of church government, appears to us, apart from many other

considerations, to strike at fundamental principles, on the security of which the very superstructure of Christianity itself depends."

This passage, which forms the whole of that portion of the Moderator's address devoted to ourselves as "Episcopalians," contains, you will observe, a great deal within a small compass. And regarding the representation as made by one who looks at us from without, and who has had perhaps no special opportunities of becoming thoroughly acquainted with our position and principles, we need not, I think, complain that it does us, upon the whole, much injustice. But certainly it suggests matter and affords a ground not only for counter argument, but for indicating particulars as to which our views are less correctly and less adequately apprehended than we should desire them to be. Upon these accounts, I purpose to examine the passage *seriatim;* and in order to do so more effectually, shall reduce its contents under four heads. Allow me to bespeak your patience while I perform this task as concisely as I can, without injustice to the cause in which we are all interested.

I. Of the Doctrine held by Episcopalians in regard to the Three Orders of the Ministry.

First, then, I need not hesitate to confess we "think that a true"—I would rather say *a truly*, that is, *a properly and perfectly constituted*—"Church must have office-bearers," not necessarily "with the names of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons," but with the three

Orders which those names, as a matter of early and long-continued use, are understood to represent. So far from laying any stress upon the names themselves, we consider that the nomenclature[1] has undergone a change, inasmuch as the three orders were originally represented by the names — (1.) Apostles; (2.) Presbyters, described as *Episcopi, i.e.*, overseers, *in relation to their flocks;* and (3.) Deacons. We entertain this view, both on other accounts, and because we see no reason to doubt the statement made by Theodoret early in the fifth century; made therefore without any aim or regard to our present controversy, for at that time there was no such thing as Presbyterianism in the Church.[2] The statement I refer to is in these words:—"Formerly they used to call the same persons Presbyters and Bishops; and those who are now called Bishops they named Apostles; but after a time they left the name of the apostleship to those who were truly *Apostles* [*i.e.*, *Missionaries*, persons *sent* specially into all the world, to preach the Gospel to every creature], and gave the name of the Episcopate to those who before were called Apostles."[3]

But the Moderator goes on to say of us, we "do not seem to consider it of any importance that even in the Churches which have given those names (Bishops, Priests, and Deacons) to their office-

[1] See Appendix, chap. ii., of this Address, as reprinted in 1866.

[2] There is no evidence that the sect of Aerius (on whom see next number of this series, p. 491) spread itself, or survived after his death.

[3] (*a*) In 1 Timoth. iii. 1, vol. iii. pp. 652; see also p. 446 and 459. A similar statement, of an earlier date, is to be found in Ambrosiaster, as quoted by Bingham, Book II. c. ii. 1, from Amalarius, "De Offic. Eccles." See above, No. 4 of this series, p. 205.

bearers, the powers and duties of each have been altogether different in different countries and in different ages." It is true we do not consider this circumstance, as stated by Dr Pirie, to be of importance; and why? simply because we do not believe it. Rather we believe—without denying that a few extraordinary exceptions may be met with here and there—we believe, I say, the contrary to have been the standing rule, and the ordinary, constant, acknowledged fact. We know, indeed, that in the more corrupt times which preceded the Reformation, the Bishops of Rome, as they set themselves up altogether above their brethren in the Episcopate, so they, and the Schoolmen in their interest, did much to confound and to obliterate the legitimate duties and distinctions of the three Orders; and further, we know that this obliteration and confusion tended, in Scotland and elsewhere, to prepare the way, when Popery was overthrown, for the violent reaction which reduced the three Orders first to two, and then practically to one—that is, to Presbyters only.[1] But that, during the first ten or twelve centuries of the Church, the powers and duties of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons have been "altogether different in different countries, and in different ages," as Dr Pirie, it seems, would have us to believe, this certainly we do not take into account, because, as I have said, we are persuaded of the contrary; that is, that there are, and always have been from the first, certain essential differences between the three Orders—differences which have justified and required, as a standing rule, a thrice repeated process of Ordination, in order to convey the distinctive

[1] (*a*) See above, No. 2 of this series, p. 75; and No. 5, p. 240.

powers appropriate to each. That Bishops have been accustomed in some countries to intrust by commission, or otherwise, more power to Presbyters than has been usual or allowed in others—*e.g.*, power to administer Confirmation (though still under certain restrictions which have kept the privilege substantially in their own hand)[1] and to intrust less power to Deacons—*e.g.*, not to suffer them generally to baptize[2]—this we freely admit; but we are unable to find any sufficient proof, for instance, that the Holy Eucharist was ever commonly allowed to be consecrated, except by clergy who had been admitted to the second Order—*i.e.*, by Presbyters; or that Ordination was ever commonly allowed to be given, except by clergy who had been admitted to the first Order—that is, by Bishops; though we grant that in ordination to the Presbyterate, the Presbyters who were present joined with the Bishop in the laying on of hands, as they still do among ourselves, and in the Church of England, and as they appear to have done from the first.[3] If Dr Pirie, or any other, will endeavour charitably to show that we are mistaken in our conclusion upon this point—a point which we consider of the utmost importance—he shall have, I promise him, our best attention; and further, for myself, I undertake, with God's help, to follow the investigation by whomsoever made—if only made in a fair and truth-seeking spirit—though all the evidence of antiquity, not in dependence upon second-hand quotations which have been bandied to and fro

[1] (*a*) See Bingham, Book XII. c. ii. 2.
[2] (*a*) See Bingham, Book II. c. xx. 9.
[3] See 1 Tim. iv. 14 compared with 2 Tim. i. 6.

between the advocates of Presbyterianism and Episcopacy, but by a careful and conscientious examination of the original authorities. And as a most powerful inducement to a competent scholar and theologian to attempt the task, let me add that, should the result prove other than that which we anticipate, it would suffice, I trust, to remove the obstacle which now prevents intercommunion between the Established Church of England, with its sister and affiliated branches throughout the world, on the one hand, and the Established Church of this country, on the other.

That the intercommunion I speak of may be effected sooner or later, we must all desire; but the only legitimate way to effect it, as we believe, is to be looked for in restoring to the Presbyterian Establishment of this country a clerical organisation similar to that under which not only Scotland, but the whole of Christendom was originally enrolled into the Church of Christ. Let it not be supposed, however, when I say this, that we consider it by any means essential that the minor details of ecclesiastical organization, or the arrangements of public worship, should be made altogether uniform in the two countries. Upon this point I would desire to refer to the ninth book of Bingham's "Antiquities;" and more particularly to the "Conclusion" of that book, "wherein is proposed an easy and honourable method for establishing a primitive Diocesan Episcopacy (conformable to the model of the smaller sort of ancient Dioceses) in all the Protestant Churches." And, again, I would refer to what Bingham has said in that important posthumous preface now printed

towards the end of his collected works in which he alludes to the same method as one "that might prove," he says, "a firm foundation for a solid peace and union between the two divided Churches of England and Scotland, whose differences at present about Church Government seem to forebode no good to the nation, or to religion in general." Moreover, I would venture to reproduce a statement which I myself made, now ten years ago, when I first advocated this proposed union—"It is easy to foresee in many ways how great would be the advantages which both parties might mutually derive from the different experience and example of each other by such an intercommunion. The one, *i.e.*, the Established Church of England, might be taught how to regain the influence which she has partially lost over the middle classes, and to watch more carefully than she has hitherto done against the encroachments of the civil power. The other, *i.e.*, the Church Established in this country, might learn to adapt herself more extensively both to high and low, and to draw from her own resources, more than her present circumstances permit, those weapons of defence against the enemies of Divine truth, which are nowhere to be found without opportunities for learned leisure and laborious research."[2] Lastly, I would freely grant to Dr Pirie that in the actual working of the church system the power and privileges of Presbyters, on account of the place which they occupied in Diocesan Synods as the Bishop's consistory, appear to have been greater in the second

[1] (*a*) Vol. ix. p. 407, quoted above, No. 6, p. 288.

[2] (*a*) See above, No. 2 of this series, p. 70, note.

century than in the fourth and subsequent ages; probably, in part at least, because, as their numbers increased, such synodal meetings became matters of greater difficulty, and consequently of less frequency. There is a similar difference at the present day between the position of Presbyters in our own comparatively small body, and their position in the Church of England.[1] But the point which is of real importance to be borne in mind, and which does not appear to have attracted the attention of Presbyterian writers, is this—the reasonableness, *à priori*, of *a graduated initiation, at certain intervals of time, to the complete exercise of functions so sacred and so solemn as those which the Christian ministry, in the plenitude of its authority, is called upon to discharge;* and consequently the ground we have for expecting the Divine provision of such a scheme in order to the due administration of the worship and ordinances of true religion.

In addition to this, other *à priori* arguments may be suggested, and will not be altogether without their weight to a thoughtful mind. On the one hand, it is conceivable that there may exist some mystical analogy between the *Three Orders of the one true Ministry*, all alike as they consist of men, but diversified in their ministrations, and the *Three Persons of the One true God*, Who is the great object of our worship, revealed to us as of one and the same nature, but as of different and subordinated attributes in the dispensation of their goodness towards our fallen race.

[1] (*a*) See my paper read at the Carlisle Church Congress, 1884, "What can England learn from Scotland on Religious matters?" Also address to the Students at Aberdeen, 1886, p. 18, *sq.*

On the other hand, inasmuch as the ordinance of the ministry is designed for the benefit of all mankind, it would seem to be desirable that it should comprise degrees by which it may represent the actual state, and adapt itself more readily to the wants, of the various ranks and conditions of human society.

II. Of the Evidence of Scripture as Interpreted by "Episcopalians."

Passing over for the present the sentence of the Moderator's address in which our supposed views respecting faith and holiness are alluded to in a way which I do not recognise as by any means an adequate or just description of our real sentiments, we may now proceed to the second main head of the passage under review, in which Presbyterianism is preferred, "not only as founded on the word of God, and agreeable thereto, but as being the system of church government nearest the scriptural model, so far as Scripture enables us to form any definite conclusion on the subject." In dealing with these words, I shall take occasion to explain at full length what I conceive to be our own view of the evidence which the Scripture affords upon the subject before us; a view from which it will appear that we cannot properly speak of one system of church government being more scriptural than another, any more than we can properly speak of union in the Church being more scriptural than disunion. It is certain, from the old Testament, that only one definite system was allowed by God in the Jewish Church, and it is equally certain, from the New Testament, that the Christian

Church, wherever planted, was gradually forming itself into one definite system; and the question to be considered is, *What was the organisation into which it eventually settled down?* Our own answer to this question will appear from the examination which I am now to make of the scriptural evidence.

Threefold Ministry under the Law.

In the first place, then, we learn that God Himself appointed a threefold ministry for the government of His Church under the elder dispensation, and that the Jews religiously maintained such a ministry in their High Priest, Priests, and Levites. This is a fact which no one at the present day will be disposed to question. And yet we know that immediately after the ordinance of this ministry had been prescribed by God, and established by Moses in accordance with the Divine command, there arose a large and influential body of men, "two hundred and fifty princes of the assembly," headed by Korah, a chief of the tribe of Levi, who were not satisfied with the proof which God had given in favour of the ordinance; who denied that Aaron had any sufficient authority for acting as High Priest, and accused him openly of usurping that office, of taking too much upon him, and of lifting himself up above the congregation. And it is not impossible that they fell into this error (for which I need not remind you how signally they were punished with instant death by God Himself) from choosing to suppose that they understood the word and the command of God better than Moses himself had done. They

could not, indeed, fail to know that special duties were assigned to Aaron, which no other Priest or Levite was authorized to perform. But still they might observe that in the very text where the institution of the High Priesthood is first commanded, viz., Exodus xxviii. 1, it is called simply "the priest's office." And so, again, the successor of Aaron the High Priest is called simply by the name of "Priest" in Exodus xxix. 29, 30, and elsewhere;[1] *a sufficient indication that in discussions of this nature we must look not only or chiefly to the use of words and names, even in Scripture itself, but to the things themselves.*[2] It is then, I repeat, an undoubted fact that a threefold ministry was instituted by express authority from God Himself in the law, and so affords an example which *it is reasonable to expect would be followed under the gospel:* for we must bear in mind that the Church under the law and the Church under the Gospel are not two different and discordant Churches, but rather two distinct stages and conditions of one and the same Church. And such a ministry having been once plainly prescribed by Divine command, there would be less occasion to enter into details respecting its continuation in the

[1] (*a*) See, *e.g.*, Numb. xxvii. 22, Josh. xiv. 1, Eleazar, the Priest; xxi. 4, Aaron, the Priest; 1 Sam. xiv. 3, Eli, the Lord's Priest; xxi. 1, Ahimelech, the Priest; xxx. 7, Abiathar, the Priest.

[2] We are sometimes challenged to produce a text from the New Testament in which the Three Orders of the Christian ministry are mentioned *together;* but is there any text of the Old Testament in which the Three orders of the Jewish Ministry are so mentioned? or anything more conclusive than the fact that St Paul writes to Timothy, as *Bishop*, about the *Priests* (or *Episcopi*, overseers of flocks), and *Deacons* whom he is to ordain? See 1 Tim. iii.

New Testament; just as no fresh directions are given in the New Testament for the building and ordering of Christian churches, or for the observance of the Christian Sabbath, although it cannot be supposed that the gospel would lead us to regard either of these matters as of little or no importance. It is certain, moreover, that the ancient Fathers of the Church (who were far from anticipating any such discussion as that in which we are now engaged) were wont to recognise *a legitimate parallel between the three orders of the Jewish and the Christian hierarchy.* Take, for example, the words of the learned Jerome in his 146th epistle[1]—"That we may know," says he, "that the ordinances of the Apostles were drawn from the Old Testament, that which Aaron and his sons, and the Levites were in the Temple, the same let the Bishops,[2] Presbyters, and Deacons claim to be in the Church." And, again, in his book against Jovinian[3]—"Both in the *Old* and *New* Testament the High Priests are one order, the Priests another, and the Levites another." Moreover, the titles of *Pontifex Maximus* and *Summus Sacerdos* (High Priest) are given to Bishops by St Jerome and other Fathers. And further, it is to be remembered that the New Testament itself speaks

[1] To Evangelus, vol. i. p. 1195.

[2] He does not say "The Bishop," as if there were to be only one,—a Pope. This therefore is no argument (as some have objected) in favour of Popery, that is, of one universal Bishop. The same parallelism occurs in St Clement's first Epistle, c. 40; a passage, however, which perhaps admits of some doubt, and therefore I did not quote it in the text.

[3] Lib. ii. c. 28, vol. ii. p. 325. See Bp. Pearson, "Vind. Ignat.," p. 322.

of Christians "perishing in the gainsaying of Core;"[1] which would seem to imply that insubordination, similar in kind to that of which Core had been guilty, may be committed in the Christian Church.

I know it has been said that the foregoing comparison is unsound, inasmuch as it interferes with the Priestly office of our blessed Lord. But such an objection, though plausible perhaps at first sight, is plainly untenable; because if it proved anything against the Christian hierarchy, it must prove no less against the Jewish. Under the law, Christ was to the faithful Jew the only Mediator, "being the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," as He is also, to the faithful Christian, the only Mediator under the gospel: but as then he made use of human instruments to teach His commands, and to apply, by anticipation, the benefits of His sacrifice; so now He makes use of a human ministry to preach His gospel, and to apply, retrospectively, and with the addition of a most holy mystery, the benefits of that same full, perfect, and all-sufficient sacrifice. Further than this, and the greater powers which a more spiritual Ordination may convey, there is, I believe, no material difference between the two ministries; except that, whereas the Jewish priesthood was partial and occasional, and restricted to a single Tribe, and in part to a single Family, being intended only for a single nation, and to serve for a certain time, the Christian ministry is not so restricted, and, moreover, is catholic or universal, both as to time and place.

[1] Jude 11. See above, No. 3 of this series, p. 139.

Christ's own Ministry on Earth a Threefold one.

But to pass on, secondly, to the ministry which was set on foot by our blessed Lord during his own sojourn upon earth, and of which He himself condescended to act visibly in person as the Bishop or chief pastor—an office which He still retains in the highest and most universal sense.[1] We have not, indeed, sufficient evidence to prove that during this short and peculiar interval the steps which were taken for the preaching of repentance, and for proclaiming the glad tidings of the Gospel within the boundaries of the Holy Land, are to be regarded as an absolutely certain and conclusive rule for the constitution of the ministry which was to come after. But still it is a fact—a fact, we must admit, of some significance—that the preaching which took place under the personal guidance of our Lord upon earth was carried on by *a system* not *of parity*, but *of imparity*, and that *of three orders:* the seventy Disciples being inferior in office, and gifted with less ample powers than the twelve Apostles, and both being subject to their Divine Master. And more than this, it is equally certain that when that period was about to close by the ascension of our blessed Lord, He himself did elevate the Twelve into His own place as the future overseers and governors of His Church, when He said to them after His Resurrection, "As my Father has sent me, even so I send you;"[2] and not only the Twelve, but their partners and successors

[1] 1 Pet. ii. 25.

[2] John xx. 21. See Beveridge's works, vol. ii. p. 112.

in the apostolic office to the end of time, when He further promised, "Lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." [1]

Such was the great undying commission of the Christian Ministry. But how was it to be executed? Was it to be carried out by the Apostles acting collectively as a Presbytery, or individually as Bishops? The answer to be given to this question would seem sufficient to determine the whole matter in debate. If we shall find that the Apostles felt it necessary to meet together whenever any business of importance was to be transacted in the government of the Church, then we must conclude that it was to the Apostolic Body collectively that the commission was conveyed, and, consequently, they themselves would be bound in due season to commit the same, not to individuals severally, but to bodies of men. But if, on the other hand, we shall discover that they were accustomed to act singly on such occasions, and that each Apostle regarded himself as invested with full power in his own person to exercise discipline, to order details of public worship, to ordain Presbyters, and to admonish them when ordained; if we find these things, then we can have no room to doubt that such was the intention of our Lord's words, and that the same administrative power was afterwards to be committed, upon the same understanding, to all whom the Apostles themselves should ordain to join or succeed them in their high office.

[1] Matt. xxviii. 20. See Moberly's discourses on "The Great Forty Days," p. 45. "These words belong to the Apostles, as to a perpetual corporation." Compare above, No. 2, p. 73, note, and my "Remarks on Bp. Lightfoot," p. 20, note.

Threefold Ministry in the Church organised by the Apostles.

Now, then, let us look, thirdly, to the ministry of the Apostles, so far as that ministry, which was also in many respects special and peculiar, is capable of throwing light upon the government of the Church in its ordinary and settled state. One of the instructions which the Twelve received from their Divine Master, and which, we know, they had constant occasion to put in practice, was this—"When they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another" (Matt. x. 23). It would be most unreasonable to look in many instances, or perhaps to look at all, for the settled establishment of diocesan Episcopacy under such circumstances, even if the mission of the Apostles, which extended to "all the world," had permitted them to remain stationary; and yet we find that very much was effected during their lifetime towards the general introduction of such a system. At Jerusalem, where our Lord's own ministry had prepared the way, and where previous experience of a threefold ministry under the law would render the reception of a similar ministry among the Christian converts easy and natural; at Jerusalem, I say, *Episcopacy may be traced with certainty to the earliest period of the Apostolic Church.* In Gentile lands the same result could only be arrived at by slow degrees. Accordingly, we find St Paul, even at the close of his ministry, directing Timothy, as Bishop of Ephesus, to be careful not to ordain "a novice" (1 Tim. iii. 6). It is, indeed, a great mistake if we imagine that the Apostles had nothing to do but to

lay down their plan of ecclesiastical polity, and forthwith it would be received and carried into effect. Whereas it is obvious that there must be—if not a supply of persons fit to be ordained before there could be occasion for the residence of a Bishop to ordain them—if not a body of clergy requiring superintendence before there could be need for the authority of a Bishop to superintend them—yet, at all events, an individual fully qualified to be consecrated as Bishop, before an inspired Apostle would be prepared to consecrate him. Hence it is that in so many of St Paul's Epistles we find reference to *extraordinary gifts*, and still more frequent allusions to false teachers, but *little or no proof of an ordinary settled ministry*. In some Churches we observe that the great Apostle himself, notwithstanding all his advantages, experienced very serious difficulty, and was reduced to have recourse to all the arts of the most consummate leadership, in order to maintain even his own authority. This was especially the case at Corinth—the Church to which the advocates of Presbyterianism are accustomed to refer as affording the strongest testimony in favour of the existence of their system during the apostolic times.[1] But in spite of all these hindrances, enough was done, not only at Jerusalem, but among the Gentiles, in all the chief cities of the then inhabited world—enough, I say, was done by the Apostles themselves to show what was the polity they were aiming to establish,

[1] It is to be remembered that St Clement's first Epistle to the Corinthian Church, which represents it as in a very disorganised state, and, apparently, without a Bishop, was written (by a Bishop) most probably *before* A.D. 70. See Hefele, Prolog., p. xxxvi.

and did actually establish, either in their own persons or in the persons of others, so soon as circumstances would permit.

In order to put this matter in the clearest point of view, it will be desirable to conduct our examination (as all such inquiries concerning the gradual upgrowth of an institution ought to be conducted) with a careful regard both to time and place. The time embraced reaches to the conclusion of the first century, and may be divided into three periods—

1st. From the Ascension, A.D. 33, to St Paul's first apostolic journey, A.D. 45.

2d. From St Paul's first apostolic journey to his martyrdom at Rome, A.D. 68.

3d. From the death of St Paul to the death of St John, A.D. 100.

First Apostolic Period, A.D. 33-45.[1]

During the first period we have the fullest reason to believe that James was acting at Jerusalem as its Bishop, and continued so to act till his martyrdom in the year 67. It is true we have no account in the New Testament of his consecration or appointment to the episcopate, but neither have we any scriptural account of the appointment of Presbyters in that city. They are first mentioned incidentally in Acts xi. 30. And the tender forbearance practised under the guidance of the Holy Spirit towards the Jewish

[1] (*a*) In this and the two following sections the reader will find little more than a summarised repetition of the statement given at length in No. 4 of this series. The repetition is accounted for in the Introduction to No. 7, p. 342.

priesthood, as a Divine ordinance, up to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, may have been the cause of silence upon the subject in either case. But inasmuch as Jerusalem, the Mother Church, is held out to us in the New Testament as the type and model of future Christendom,[1] let us see what the New Testament does actually tell us respecting James, whom all Christian antiquity with one voice declares to have been made first Bishop of Jerusalem. The New Testament, then, tells us that our blessed Lord, after His resurrection, appeared to *James* separately and in private.[2] It tells us that St Peter, when he had been miraculously released from prison by an angel, sent specially to let *James* know.[3] It tells us that on three several occasions, which embrace together a period of at least twenty years, *James* was found by St Paul in residence at Jerusalem, and visited by that great Apostle and missionary of the Gentiles, as one whom it concerned even him to see and confer with;[4] and that on the last of these occasions he and his fellow-travellers "went in unto *James;* and *all the Presbyters* were present"—as if to receive them in a solemn synod. It tells us that at the first council of the Christian Church, held at Jerusalem, where not only Presbyters, but the Apostles were present, *James* spoke after all the rest, claimed to be "hearkened to," and finally declared in set form his own "sentence" as the determination of the Assembly.[5] It tells us that at Antioch certain persons of Jerusalem, representing themselves as having come from *James* (whether acting by his

[1] 1 Thess. ii. 14, comp. Isa. ii. 3. [2] 1 Cor. xv. 7.
[3] Acts xii. 17. [4] Gal. i. 19, ii. 9; Acts xxi. 18. [5] Acts xv.

authority or no), had sufficient influence to induce both St Peter and St Barnabas to alter their course of conduct upon a difficult question of the first importance.[1] It shows us that St Jude, at the beginning of his Epistle, denominates himself, and is denominated by St Luke, both in his Gospel and in the Acts, as "brother of *James*," evidently because Jude himself, though an Apostle, would not only be distinguished, but elevated and ennobled by this relationship. Lastly, it exhibits the Epistle of *St James* as placed before those of St Peter, and St John,[2] and St Jude; and as addressed "to the twelve tribes scattered abroad"—*i.e.*, to the Hebrew Christians who would still resort to Jerusalem at the great festivals, and so would fall, in a more especial manner, under the jurisdiction of St James.[3] To these various passages of the New Testament I will only add that Eusebius gives a complete catalogue of the Bishops who succeeded James at Jerusalem down to his own time in the fourth century.

If it be urged, against all this, that James, though seen to act episcopally, does not receive the name of Bishop in the sacred record, so neither, be it observed, do the seven Deacons (all or any of them) receive their name, although respecting the institution of their office there can be little[4] or no doubt. It is not till we come to the latest of St Paul's

[1] Gal. ii. 12.

[2] His name takes precedence of theirs, Gal. ii. 9.

[3] He alludes to his Presbyters, v. 14; "Is any sick? Let him send for the Presbyters of the Church."

[4] I forbear to speak *quite positively*, because St Chrysostom, on Acts, Homily xiv., has raised a doubt whether "the seven" were Deacons in the clerical sense.

Epistles, written some thirty years after the appointment of "the seven," that the official name of Deacons occurs as such in the New Testament.[1] I conclude, therefore, from the foregoing evidence, that the Apostles, as they had all concurred in establishing the threefold ministry at Jerusalem, so when the time came for them to go forth and preach the gospel to the Gentiles, they would each carry with them the same system as his model, and thus all the Churches would eventually be built up—as we know they were—upon one and the same plan.

And here I pause for a moment to inquire of the Moderator of the General Assembly, or any other pious and learned Presbyterian, what account or explanation is to be given of those several passages of the New Testament to which I just now referred? No account or explanation whatever, as we believe, can be given of them, except upon the supposition that the James spoken of in those passages was Bishop of Jerusalem. And yet there have been Presbyterian writers who have pronounced Episcopacy to be unscriptural! This, however, I am glad to observe, is not the ground taken up by Dr Pirie, or by the great body of those whom he addressed as Moderator. "We by no means presume," he says, "to condemn the forms of other Churches."

[1] (*a*) See the same objection answered more fully in No. 4 of this series, p. 187. A further answer may be drawn from consideration of the fact, that *no name* is given in the New Testament to the doctrine of the Holy Triniry. If a *doctrine* (confessedly essential and fundamental) be in the Bible, though without a name, why may not *an office* (essential and fundamental, as we believe) be also there, though equally unnamed?

Such has not always been the attitude of Presbyterianism. It is not, I grieve to say, the attitude assumed by the Presbyterianism of the Free Church at the present day. In the Catechism which has received the full authority and approval of the General Assembly of that Church, and of which thousands upon thousands have been circulated throughout the land, and used, alas! for the instruction of the young and uninformed, we find[1] the following question and answer — "Q. *Is there any warrant in Scripture for any class of ordinary church office-bearers, besides Presbyters and Deacons?*—A. *There is not.*" I ask (God knows not in any self-sufficient or uncharitable spirit, but in simple sorrow of heart), what, if such "anti-prelatical testimony"—so the same Catechism calls it—should prove to be testimony in opposition to the truth of God, and to the mind of Christ for the unity of His Church? That it is testimony which would have been condemned as false and heretical by the Christians of every Church in Christendom, so early as the third and fourth centuries, is no less certain than it is certain that the denial of our blessed Lord's Divinity would have been so condemned.

Second Apostolic Period, A.D. 45-68.

Passing on now to the second period, which we may call *the period of St Paul*, let us first observe that the New Testament does not profess to give any information whatever respecting the remote travels of any one of the Apostolic Twelve (reduced

[1] Chap. iv.—"Upon the Government of the Church."

to Eleven by the death of James, the son of Zebedee —Acts xii. 2) during the whole of this important time. "The Acts of the Apostles" being written by St Luke, who usually accompanied St Paul, become, in fact, the "*Acts of St Paul and his companions*" *only* after the twelfth chapter, at which our first period concludes; with the exception of the proceedings of the Council at Jerusalem, contained in the fifteenth chapter. What does this imply? Are we not to infer from it that God intended us to have recourse to such other records as are ordinarily sufficient to ascertain the truth of history? That He did not intend the Bible to be all in all to us, in regard to matters of historical fact?[1] Are we not to infer that as He taught His chosen people of old "to ask of their fathers who were before them" for the right way, notwithstanding they had the guidance of the elder Scriptures, and notwithstanding, also, the corruptions into which the Jewish Church had fallen; so He intended that we should be guided by the testimony and practice of our fathers in the faith, though in subordination always to His own Word? And if we now look aside for a moment to that testimony, what do we find as facts applicable to this second period? We find, according to the unexceptionable authority of Mr Fynes Clinton, the greatest chronologist who has appeared since the days of Scaliger—we find, I say (in addition to the first episcopate established at Jerusalem), the

[1] (*a*) Dr Milligan justly remarks, "We are apt to think that we have the whole process that led to the formation of the Church set before us in 'The Acts of the Apostles;' instead of which we have the most meagre and imperfect outlines of it."—"Croall Lecture," p. 65.

Episcopal succession commenced at Alexandria in the year 63, and at Antioch and at Rome probably at earlier dates; that is, we find in this primitive time Episcopacy established, not only at Jerusalem, but in the three chief cities of Europe, Asia, and Africa—the great divisions of the world as then known.[1] No Presbyterian of competent learning will ever venture, I believe, to deny or to grapple with this conclusive fact, which rests upon a foundation no less sure than that of the succession of Archons at Athens and of Consuls or Emperors at Rome.

But to return to the testimony of Scripture. Although those early Episcopal appointments of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria are not recorded in the New Testament,—because, as I have said, "The Acts of the Apostles" does not profess to notice the later missionary work of any of the original "twelve"—although this be true, yet the evidence which the New Testament affords, in connection with St Paul's ministry, will be found to lead to similar results. We must not, indeed, as I have before intimated, expect that the progress of building up the Church, and of organizing a threefold ministry among heathen idolaters, could be otherwise than a work of time; and consequently we shall be prepared to trace its accomplishment only by painful and slow degrees. Our blessed Lord Himself, when He entered upon His ministry, did not immediately ordain His Twelve Apostles; and afterwards, when He had appointed them, He suffered again another interval of time to elapse before He sent out the seventy Disciples. In like

[1] See Clinton's "Fasti Romani," vol. ii. pp. 534-548.

manner, as Epiphanius has justly observed, the Apostles did not at once order all things that would eventually be necessary for the administration of the Church, but proceeded gradually in their great work.[1] On the first missionary journey of St Paul and St Barnabas to the south-east region of Asia Minor (A.D. 45-46), it does not appear that any ministers were appointed; but on their return, we read, they "ordained Presbyters in every Church."[2] On St Paul's second journey (A.D. 53-55), when he was accompanied by Silas and Timothy, and when he passed onward to the West, through Macedonia and Greece, we have again no mention of any of the new converts being called to the ministry. On his third journey (A.D. 56-60), when he revisited the same regions both of Asia Minor and of Eastern Europe, as he was returning towards Jerusalem at the conclusion of his travels, we learn incidentally that a body of Presbyters had been previously ordained at Ephesus, who are described as *episcopi* or "overseers *in the flock;*"[3] for such they would naturally be, more especially during the absence of St Paul, and when an Overseer, or local *Episcopus* in the higher sense of the name, had not yet been appointed. *This is all the evidence which we meet with in the Acts.* We have no notice of Deacons in any church, nor of a settled Bishop properly so called; for *St Paul himself, we know, during all this time, was holding still in his own hands the "daily care of all the churches" which he had founded*

[1] See the passage of Epiphanius quoted in the next number of this series, p. 493.

[2] Acts xiv. 23.

[3] Acts xx. 28. See the original Greek.

(2 Cor. xi. 28). In this capacity he ordained[1] Presbyters: in this capacity he gave all necessary instructions to them when ordained.

From the Acts of the Apostles let us now pass on to the evidence which St Paul's own letters afford. Taking them in what we suppose to be their chronological order, we find in the first nine epistles—viz., to the Thessalonians (2), to the Galatians, to the Corinthians (2), to the Romans (all written before his first imprisonment at Rome), to the Ephesians, to the Colossians, to Philemon (written during that imprisonment)—we find, I say, in these nine no mention whatever of either Bishop or Presbyter, but only the name *Diaconus* and *Diaconia* (from which Deacon and Deaconship are derived); and *this applied generally to any one who ministered in the service of God, including the Apostle himself.*[2] Apostles, however, are distinctly mentioned as holding the *first rank* of the ministry in two of those epistles, viz., 1 Cor. xii. 28, and Eph. iv. 11; while in

[1] St Paul's own Ordination, together with that of Barnabas, was so unique and extraordinary that nothing can be inferred from it as a precedent, any more than from their power of working miracles. They were specially "*sent forth* by the Holy Ghost" (Acts xiii. 4) as the original Twelve had been specially *sent forth* by Christ; and St Paul expressly speaks of himself as "an Apostle, not of men, *neither by man*" (Gal. i. 1). They two alone, besides the Twelve, receive the name of Apostles in the Acts. The command given to the "Prophets and Teachers" to ordain them may be compared with the extraordinary commands given by God Himself in the Old Testament, whereby persons not Priests were empowered to do Priestly acts; *e.g.*, Moses in consecrating Aaron; Gideon, Judges vi. 26; Manoah, *Ibid.* xiii. 19.

[2] See 1 Thess. iii. 2; 1 Cor. iii. 5, xvi. 15; 2 Cor iv. 1, vi. 3, 4; Rom. xi. 13, xii. 7; Eph. iii. 7, iv. 12; Col. i. 7, iv. 7, 17.

another place of the latter epistle (ii. 20), the Church is said to be "built upon" *them*, and *the Prophets* as "*the foundation*, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone;" and in a third passage (iii. 5), "the mystery of Christ" is said to be "now revealed unto the *Holy Apostles* and *Prophets* by the Spirit." From this, and from the language in 1 Cor. xii. 28, above referred to, it would seem that persons called "Prophets" were looked upon as occupying a second rank in the Ministry, and persons called "Teachers" as occupying a third.[1]

But when we come to the four epistles which St Paul wrote last, viz., to the Philippians, to Timothy (2), and to Titus, the case is different. The first of these exhibits an advance in the formation of the ordinary ministry; at least we have now for the first time two of those names which afterwards came into common use to designate church officers, viz., "Bishops" (overseers) and "Deacons" (ministers);[2] but whether they must necessarily imply in that place two distinct orders of clergy, and, if so, what their rank, what their respective duties, and what their relations towards each other may have been, it is impossible to determine. The epistle itself gives us no information upon the point, only it shows that the Philippian Church was as yet far from being in a settled and well-organized state. It is supposed by some that the two names should be rendered, according to our present nomenclature, "Presbyters"

[1] Compare Acts xiii. 1, and see Hooker, Book v. chap. 78. The Epistle to the Ephesians was written probably about three years before Timothy was made Bishop of Ephesus by St. Paul.

[2] See Phil. i. 1; and compare the recently discovered treatise, entitled "Doctrine of the Apostles," c. 14.

and "Deacons;" and that Epaphroditus, who was then with St Paul at Rome, and whom he calls their "Apostle,"[1] was in fact their Bishop. On the other hand, St Chrysostom understands Presbyters or Priests only to be meant by both those names; for "up to that time," he says, "they still interchanged the names given to the orders of clergy; so much so that even the Bishop was called a Deacon," which he proves by reference to 2 Tim. iv. 5. "And hence," he adds, "even now many Bishops write, 'To my fellow Presbyter,' and 'To my fellow Deacon.'" In like manner, even the Apostles sometimes out of humility called themselves Presbyters (which they were, in the sense in which the superior dignity includes the inferior), but it does not appear that they were ever so called by others.[2]

Our difficulty in dealing with the scriptural passages in which we first meet with the names of our ordinary church officers arises from the fact that, in matters of this kind, Christianity did not invent new terms to express her new ideas, but was content with words and names already existing, which she *gradually* moulded and adapted to her own purposes.[3] There was little or nothing in the ordinary and accepted meaning of the three Greek words Overseers, Elders, and Ministers, which we translate Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, to determine what should be eventually their distinct and technical

[1] See the Greek, in ii. 25.

[2] See 1 Pet. v. 1; 2 John i. 1; 3 John 1.

[3] (*a*) The same ambiguity which at first belonged to the nomenclature of the Ministry belonged also to the nomenclature of the service of the Church. In regard to the use of the words *Liturgy*, *Litany*, *Sacraments*, *&c.*, see Bingham, Book xiii. c. 1.

application in the nomenclature of the Church. In proof of this, it is sufficient to point out that the two of these names which, in the first verse of the Epistle to the Philippians, are translated "Bishops and Deacons," are *both of them applied in the first chapter of the Acts to the office of the Apostles.* "His *bishopric* let another take: . . . that he may take part of this *ministry* (*Diaconia*, deaconship) and *apostleship* from which Judas by transgression fell;" and elsewhere in the New Testament even our Lord himself, who is called by St Peter "the *Episcopus* of our souls," is by St Paul denominated "the *Diaconus* of the circumcision."[1] On the other hand, it is remarkable that the "Deacons" or inferior ministers of the Jewish synagogue, were called in Hebrew *Chazanim*, which means "overseers;" and that the title of Overseer is given to inferior lay officers of parishes in the Church of England at the present day.

But when we proceed from the Epistle to the Philippians to those which St Paul wrote last (partly after his first and partly during his second and final imprisonment), viz., to Titus and to Timothy—besides the all-important and conclusive fact that those letters are addressed to *individuals* who are charged to act *episcopally* towards persons of *two other* ranks in the ministry—we see at least one example of the clerical nomenclature assuming the form into which it eventually settled down. I allude to 1 Tim. iii. 13. It is plain that in that place "the office of a Deacon" describes *a lower order* in the ministry, because it is spoken of as *a stepping-stone to a higher.* And yet that the use of the name was

[1] Rom. xv. 8.

not even yet tied down to this application *exclusively*, is evident from 2 Tim. iv. 5; where Timothy himself is exhorted to "make full proof of his ministry" (*diaconia*). So impossible is it to arrive at any sound conclusion upon this matter, unless we are to look to the things themselves—*i.e.*, to the actual offices and duties—which are in question, and not merely to the names!

Third Apostolic Period, A.D. 68-100.

It remains now to speak of the third period of the apostolic age, reaching from the martyrdom of St Paul to the death of St John. Of the long interval between these two events (upwards of thirty years) we have no inspired record. Yet it was during this interval, for the most part, that the foundations of the Church were laid throughout the world. And upon what principle were they laid? There can be but one answer to this question, unless we are prepared to maintain that all ecclesiastical history is false. They were laid upon *the principle of uniformity*, as exhibited in the threefold ministry of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; the germs of which are seen in the sacred notices of the position of St James at Jerusalem, in the last written Epistles of St Paul, and in the 2nd and 3rd chapters of the Revelation of St John. The epistles which St Paul wrote to Timothy and Titus, and which St John, at the dictation of Christ Himself, wrote to the "Angels" of the seven churches, are addressed in each case *not to a collective body, but to an individual.* And upon this individual in every instance the responsibility of

the good government of the Church committed to his superintendence is made to lie. If we had found any proof among the early Christian writers that the ordinary government of the Church in their days was administered not by individuals, but by collective bodies of men, then these pastoral Epistles of St Paul and St John (written at an interval of more than thirty years) would be calculated to disturb and perplex us ; but now *what we do find in those early writers fully accords with Scripture ;* and the general result which we obtain when we seek (as we ought) to compare the two — that is, our inspired and uninspired authorities—is a harmony which convinces us of the truth of both. I shall hope, God willing, to find some other opportunity of following out this inquiry by entering into the evidence of our uninspired authorities.[1] But for this—inasmuch as Dr Pirie's address makes no reference to the point—there was no call on the present occasion.

The Controversy narrowed to Two Points.

In the meantime, I would remark that the whole controversy between Presbyterians and ourselves, in regard to the bearing and interpretation of the scriptural evidence (after we have agreed that no conclusion is to be drawn from the earlier indeterminate use of the *three names* afterwards assigned to the three Orders,—after we have agreed upon this, *which is no less necessary for the Presbyterian argument than for our own, if even the Diaconate, whether Lay or Clerical, is to be retained*), the whole contro-

[1] (*a*) This will be done in the next number of this series.

versy would seem to turn upon the following questions:—(1.) *Whether the Apostles* (and here I mean all those who are so called in the New Testament) *formed a distinct order in the ministry?* and (2.) *Whether this order was intended to be continued?* In regard to the former of these points it will be taken for granted, I believe, that the Scriptures[1] themselves afford sufficient proof. And if so, they prove the existence of a threefold ministry in the Christian Church from the very first; the existence of the second and third orders not being now, I believe, called in question. So far then we see our way plainly. But in regard to the latter point, viz., whether the first order, which the Apostles occupied, was intended to be continued, there is perhaps more room for doubt.[2] For, on the one hand—(1.) The Apostles had peculiar powers, which certainly were not continued. (2.) The Apostles, if Bishops at all in our present sense of the word, were for the most part *Bishops at large—i.e.*, not attached peculiarly or exclusively each to one locality.[3] On the other hand, however—(1.) We have a presumption in

[1] The single expression of St Paul, that there "came upon *him* daily the care of all the churches" (2 Cor. xi. 28) which he had founded, without any intimation that the same care was shared by others, would seem to be conclusive. Observe also in Acts xv. 6, 22, the repetition of the Greek Article—"*The* Apostles and *the* Presbyters," as indicating two distinct Orders.

[2] (*a*) Bishop Lightfoot, in his "Dissertation on the Christian Ministry," appears to yield the point, p. 194. But see my "Remarks," in answer, p. 79; and compare his own more recent "Apost. Fathers," part ii. vol. 1, p. 378, where he quotes Irenæus, speaking of those "who were appointed Bishops by the Apostles themselves in the several Churches."

[3] But compare Eusebius (quoting Origen), "Hist. Eccles.," iii. 1.

favour of their order being intended for a continuance, and even for perpetuity, in the promise of Christ, "Lo! I am with you alway," if we accept those words as addressed only to the Eleven.[1] (2.) We have abundant testimony in the writings of the Fathers that the primitive Christians did regard the first order of the ministry—that is, those whom they called Bishops—as *successors to the Apostles in the ordinary functions of their pastoral office.* Thus St Jerome, in his 146th Epistle,[2] says—"All Bishops," —and let no one imagine there was any ambiguity in the meaning of that name in St Jerome's day,— "all Bishops are successors of the Apostles." And again, in his 41st Epistle,[3] "with us Bishops hold the place of the Apostles." And with reference to the arguments first mentioned, in regard to the peculiar character of the Apostolic office, strictly so called, the objections which those arguments raise, will be greatly weakened, if not altogether removed, when we take into account all the circumstances of the case. The Apostles had peculiar powers, because their position was in many respects a peculiar one; and when the position ceased to be peculiar, the peculiar powers ceased also. But there would still be the grand residuum of ordinary duty to be done, and ordinary powers to be received and exercised, in the position of their successors. Such a position is sufficiently marked out in the directions given by St Paul to Timothy as Bishop of Ephesus, and to Titus as Bishop of Crete, and by St John to the Angels or Bishops, of the seven churches.

[1] (*a*) See above, p. 413, note.

[2] To Evangelus, vol. i. p. 1194.

[3] To Marcellus, vol. i. p. 476.

Our Interpretation of the Scriptural Evidence the Catholic interpretation. This proved by manifest Facts of Church History.

In the interpretation which has now been put upon the scriptural evidence, let it be observed that I claim to understand that evidence, not according to any fancy of my own, but as it was understood by the early Christians. This is manifest from what they have said, and still more from what they did. *They accepted everywhere the threefold ministry.* They condemned as heretical the attempt, made for the first time in the fourth century, by a certain Presbyter named Aerius, to reduce the two first orders into one.[1] And I cannot doubt that they did both the one and the other, because they considered that the threefold ministry came recommended to them not only by the oral teaching which they had received, but by the Holy Scriptures, which were read then, as now, in every Christian assembly. Even John Knox has declared that "the learned and godly Fathers of the primitive Church did examine all matters by God's Word;"[2] and it cannot be supposed that they failed to examine this very important matter by the same rule. And without allowing themselves to be perplexed or misled by the scriptural use of words and names, the conclusion to which they came, as evidenced by what they did, may be stated in these words of Hooker, "It *clearly appeareth by Holy Scripture* that Churches apostolic did know but three degrees of ecclesiastical order, viz., Apostles, Pres-

[1] (*a*)See the next No. of this series, p. 491.
[2] See Knox's *Works*, vol. iv. p. 518.

byters, and Deacons; and afterwards, instead of Apostles, Bishops."[1] It seemed to be supposed by some who offered strictures in the public journals upon my last year's address, that because I put forward, on that occasion, the moderate and charitable statement of the Church of England, "It is evident unto *all men*, diligently reading Holy Scripture *and* ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons"—because I put forward this statement, therefore I was prepared to admit that the apostolic authority of the threefold ministry is evident to *no man* from Scripture *alone*. Such, however, is not the case. What "appeared clearly" to Hooker, appears clearly to me. What Luther declared in his own name, and in the name of the first Protestants, viz., "We see that the authority of bishops is thoroughly fortified by the Word of God,"[2] I do not hesitate to hold and to declare. But though I entertain these sentiments, I felt how difficult it would be, in the first instance, to obtain for them a fair and dispassionate hearing from those in this country who are not of our own communion. The time, however, is fast approaching—I trust it is already come—when multitudes of intelligent Presbyterians, notwithstanding the prejudices which they have inhaled, as it were, with their first breath, may yet be led to read the New Testament upon this

[1] Book v. lxxvii. 9. See above, No. 4, p. 205.

[2] Luth., "Opera," vol. viii. p. 592, "Auctoritatem Episcoporum, quam verbo Dei videmus communitam." The words are quoted from his commentary on Hosea,—the last work he wrote,—published in 1545, the year before his death. See above, No. 4, p. 158.

interesting and important subject with the same eyes and the same understanding with which the early Christians read and understood it.

To the apprehension of the early Christians the New Testament appeared to teach that the Apostles, as, on the one hand, they had succeeded to the Jewish High Priesthood, so, on the other hand, they themselves were to be succeeded by the Christian Episcopate. It appeared to teach that Bishops are to do what St James did, when, as Bishop, he presided and gave "sentence" after "much disputing" in the Apostolic council at Jerusalem. It appeared to teach that Bishops are to do what St Peter and St John did, when, in the first mission of the Christian Church, they went down to Samaria and "laid hands upon," *i.e.*, *confirmed*, those whom Philip the deacon had *converted* and *baptized*, thus putting into practice a fundamental "principle of the doctrine of Christ."[1] It appeared to teach that Bishops were to consecrate and send out other Bishops, as St Paul placed Timothy at Ephesus and Titus in Crete; and that such Bishops were to ordain Presbyters and Deacons;[2] to make the former "overseers," not over one another, but over their respective flocks,[3] and to "charge" them concerning the doctrine they were to teach, and to take them into council on all important matters,[4] and to admonish them, if occasion should

[1] Acts viii. 5-17; Heb. vi. 2. St Cyprian (Ep. lxii.), St Jerome (*Contr. Lucif.* c. 8), and Epiphanius (*Hær.* xxi. vol. i. p. 55), all interpret the passage in the Acts as referring to Episcopal Confirmation. See above, No. 5, p. 266.

[2] 1 Tim. v. 22; Titus i. 5; compare Acts xiv. 23.

[3] Acts xx. 28; 1 Pet. v. 2. [4] Acts xv.

require,[1] and to be themselves "ensamples" both of sound doctrine and of holy life. And more particularly it appeared to teach that ordination of Priests was to be administered *by* (διὰ) laying on of the Bishop's hands, together *with* (μετὰ) the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, as St Paul administered it to Timothy,[2] and as it is administered in our own Church and in the Church of England at the present day.

Such is a brief outline of the interpretation which the early Christians put upon the teaching of the New Testament in regard to the origin and upgrowth of the Christian ministry. I am well aware that theories more or less different from this have been devised, *since the Reformation*, by German and Swiss writers, *in order to meet the necessities of an uncatholic position, and to justify a foregone conclusion*—theories which, for the most part, condemn the whole primitive Church, inasmuch as they virtually condemn all its Bishops of usurpation, and all its Presbyters and Deacons, and all its Laity, of pusillanimity and faithlessness. Yes! at a time when they were prepared bravely to meet the most excruciating death rather than betray the faith they had received, they were guilty, we are to believe, universally guilty, on the one hand of *unholy ambition*, and of *pusillanimity and of faithlessness* on the other! With regard to the view which, in common with the Church of England, we ourselves have received and hold, that there are no passages of Scripture *seemingly* at variance with it, we do not contend; nay, we grant the contrary; as we grant there are passages *seemingly*

[1] Rev. ii. iii. [2] 2 Tim. i. 6; 1 Tim. iv. 14.

at variance with the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity and of our Lord's Divinity. All we plead for in this case, as in those, is a fair and candid comparison of all the passages that may assist us to form a sound judgment; and in this case, as in those, we solemnly deprecate and disallow the conclusion that because there may, after all, be *some room for doubt in regard to this or that passage, therefore there can be no sufficient ground for certainty in regard to the issue of the whole;* more especially when we take into the account, as we ought to do, the scriptural *command*, so repeatedly urged, of unity and uniformity, and the *result* of unity and uniformity *actually obtained during so many centuries*—a result which at first was due, we may suppose, to the oral teaching and practice of the Apostles even more than to their writings. Furthermore, in the case before us, equally as in the case of those fundamental doctrines just now named, we solemnly deprecate and disallow the conclusion that this admitted amount of doubt and uncertainty is to be held to prove either that the matter itself is *comparatively unimportant, or that it has not been divinely ruled.*[1] To conclude thus would compel us also to the conclusion that the Divine command of unity and uniformity is either a trifling or a cruel one: trifling, if it was given to be disobeyed with indifference; cruel, if no sufficient care was taken on God's part to provide or particularise the means by which it might be obeyed. By such reasoning we do wrong at once to God and to

[1] The Doctrine of the Trinity, the observance of the Christian Sabbath, and of Infant Baptism might, *with more reason*, be regarded as indifferent or open questions *on the same ground.*

ourselves. Upon such principles the complication of our "unhappy divisions" can never be unravelled. It can only become, as time goes on, more complex, more entangled; till at length, instead of the one Church which Christ established, and for which He prayed, we shall be tempted, in the proverbial diversity of human sentiments, to adopt, or at least to tolerate, the maxim that every man may become a Church unto himself—"Quot homines, tot Ecclesiæ!"

III. Of the Importance attached by "Episcopalians" to Faith and Holiness.

I pass on now to the third head of that portion of the Moderator's address with which we have to deal. "Forms of [Church] government," he says, "we hold to be only means towards the attainment of an end." This would seem to imply a misgiving as to any sufficient proof derivable from Scripture in favour of Presbyterianism. The condition of mind which can speak of a system supposed to be "founded on the Word of God, and agreeable thereto, and nearer than any other to the scriptural model," as "*only* a mean towards the attainment of an end," cannot be thought to regard the intimations of Scripture upon the point otherwise than either as uncertain, or as of little account. At best, it sounds somewhat strangely, so to speak, when the "mean" in question, we are to believe, is *eminently scriptural*, and when "the end" to be attained by it is nothing less than the good government of Christ's Church, with a view to God's glory, and the salvation of souls, according to His

blessed will. But the truth is, we are not justified in attempting to make any such clear and broad distinction between *end* and *means* in things sacred and divine as Dr Pirie ventures to assume.[1] The same language "it is only a mean," might have been used by the Jew who refused to be circumcised, or even to keep the Sabbath; and might still be used by the heathen who refuses to be baptized, or by the Christian who refuses to receive the Holy Communion: but we know how presumptuous and how dangerous it would be so to use it. And if it is replied that to refuse in any of these cases would be to break a Divine command, but that there is no such command in the case before us, then I would rejoin that such a reply appears to beg the main question in debate by denying what we assert —viz., the existence of what is *virtually equivalent to a Divine command*. That God has expressly commanded Unity in His Church—formal, visible Unity, as the Presbyterian standards rightly maintain—we are generally agreed. That in so doing He has virtually commanded one uniform organisation of church ministry (uniform, I mean, in essentials, though not in details), by which that Unity might be secured—this is what we maintain, but Dr Pirie is not prepared to grant.

I had occasion to object to this dangerous distinction between end and means, in the argument of my last year's address.[2] A similar distinction between "essentials" and "circumstantials" was objected to

[1] The same assumption is made by Lord Macaulay, "History of England," vol. v. p. 339. For an answer to it, see my "Remarks on Bp. Lightfoot's Essay," p. 13, *seq.*

[2] (*a*) See the preceding No. of this series, p. 350.

in like manner by Bishop John Skinner, when brought forward by a predecessor of Dr Pirie, Principal Campbell of Aberdeen, in his "Lectures on Ecclesiastical History," more than sixty years ago. The Principal, arguing against the obligation of the threefold ministry, had called it "an absurdity to make the truth of God's promises depend on *circumstantials*."[1] The Bishop replied, "We cannot see much propriety, or any advantage, arising to religion in thus splitting it into *essentials* and *circumstantials*, for the sake of weighing the one against the other, because there is much danger of not making a proper division;" and he added the following very apposite quotation from the great Bishop Butler:—"As it is one of the peculiar weaknesses of human nature, when upon a comparison of two things, one is found to be of greater consequence than the other, to consider this other of scarce any importance at all, it is highly necessary that we remind ourselves *how great presumption it is to make light of any institutions of Divine appointment;* that our obligations to obey all God's commands whatever are absolute and indispensable; and that commands *merely positive*, admitted to be from Him, lay us under a *moral obligation* to obey Him—an obligation moral *in the strictest and most proper sense*."[2]

But to return to the remarks of Dr Pirie: "To put the means," he says, "on the same footing as the end, and to assume that the Supreme Being loves not faith and holiness for their own sakes, but only faith and holiness developed under a special organisation of church government, appears to us, apart from

[1] Vol. i. p. 87. [2] "Primitive Truth, etc., Vindicated," p. 105.

many other considerations, to strike at fundamental principles, on the security of which the very superstructure of Christianity itself depends." Here, again, the attempt is made to separate and put asunder things which God, as we believe, has not separated, but, on the contrary, has joined together. It is true we attribute very great importance to a special organisation of church government, and why? because we believe that special organisation to be scriptural and Divine—in other words to be *God's sufficiently declared will for the uniform government of His Church;* and because we hold that obedience to God's supposed will in all respects is not something distinguishable and apart from faith and holiness, but on the contrary, that which is *indispensable and essential to both.* Upon any other principle than this a sceptic or an infidel may be a holy man. There is nothing in the narrow notion of personal holiness, taught and practised as it has been in the school of natural religion, which could make it necessary, for example, to *believe* the doctrine of the Trinity or the divinity of the Holy Ghost, or to *receive* the sacrament of Baptism or of the Lord's Supper. These truths and these ordinances are only (so to speak) *means to the attainment of an end.* But they are, we believe, scriptural and divinely ordained means to the attainment of the greatest of all ends. And so we believe that the system of a uniformly organised ministry is a scriptural and divinely ordained means for the attainment of a twofold end—viz., *the unity* and *the extension of Christ's Church:* and who shall say how great these ends are in the councils of the Most High? It is

not to be doubted that God may constitute the trial of our obedience as He pleases. We know that in the case of our first parents He made their only trial to consist in not eating of the fruit of a certain tree; and knowing this, we certainly do not presume to distinguish very nicely between supposed means and ends, when God, as we believe, *has commanded both.* We do not consider that the "very superstructure of Christianity is endangered" when we decline to pronounce whether an habitual drunkard or an habitual Sabbath-breaker is the less holy man; or whether one who is dishonest has a better chance of going to heaven than another who neglects the most ordinary means of grace, such as prayer and public worship. Nor again, do we feel called upon to decide which form of church government makes men the best Christians; though we certainly suppose that nothing which God intended us either to believe or to do, can be lost or neglected without a corresponding loss in our Christian character.

Meanwhile, it is doing us but scanty justice to say of us, as Dr Pirie does, that "we admit that holiness is necessary to salvation, and that even faith is necessary, in so far as it may be a means of generating holiness;" when the truth is, we not only admit, but maintain, *the indispensable necessity of both faith and holiness*, quite as strenuously as it is possible for any society of Christians to maintain it. And on the other hand, so far from denying that baptised Presbyterians are members of the Church, or that their faith is available for salvation—both which opinions Dr Pirie appears to think are prevalent among us,—I can truly say for

my own part, I utterly repudiate them; and I believe, my brethren, that you, as a body, would be no less ready to repudiate them for yourselves, and for the Church to which you belong. What shall constitute saving faith and saving holiness in the case of each individual among them, as among ourselves, must depend, I suppose, under God's mercy, upon the sincerity of repentance for all conscious disobedience or wilful neglect of the Divine will. These, however, are questions upon which there is no need to enter. It is enough to see and know that *our present state of separation is a sinful one;* and, inasmuch as it cannot be otherwise than injurious, in some degree, to the faith and holiness of us all, and obstructive in many instances to the reception of the Gospel, and generally to the extension of Christ's kingdom, it becomes our duty to endeavour, so far as we can, to escape from it. God will determine who those are that are most responsible for the sin as it exists; and whose will be the offence if we are still to continue without any sufficient effort being made to search it out and to amend it. He will know and judge whether the evidence which He has given us in favour of one uniform system for the government of His Church be, or be not, *sufficient*, consisting, as it does, of *the voice of Scripture* and of *the interpretation put upon that voice by the universal Church in its primitive and purest time*. Nor can we imagine, without great and most unjustifiable presumption, that the primitive Christians were either less able to interpret Scripture, or less anxious to interpret it correctly, and to act upon it conscientiously, than we are ourselves. And even if there be any to whom

that evidence may appear insufficient, and who will determine to see nothing more in this question than a matter of mere expediency, though still a matter (for this they must acknowledge) bearing upon the better observance of God's command of unity and brotherly love throughout the United Kingdom of which we are all subjects; if there are any thus minded, then, I would ask all such, whether of the two is the more reasonable expectation—to expect that England should enter upon a course entirely new to her, except so far as the change might be similar to the arrangement made, or rather attempted, during the short crisis of rebellion and revolution in the time of Cromwell; or to expect that Scotland should return to an organisation similar to that under which she originally received the gospel, and from which, although she has more than once broken away, she has done so, for the most part, *not in consequence of any well-grounded objection to the system itself, but under provocations chiefly of a political origin*, the recurrence of which she would have no cause to fear at the present day.

I know it has been said by some objectors, in view of the proposal which I now urge, that the force of the presumption in favour of giving way to England (or, as I understand it, giving way, not *to England*, but *to the truth of God*) is greatly weakened when we look to the superior number of non-Episcopal Protestants[1] upon the Continent of Europe and through-

[1] I know not how far this may be correct in regard to "Protestants," which is a mere negative denominator; but in regard to Christians in general it is calculated that out of the whole number now existing in the world, viz., 260 millions, 230 millions are Episcopalians.

out the world. But to this I would reply, *first*, that intercommunion between foreigners and ourselves as Scotchmen is a matter of far less moment, because a matter far less practical and effectual for good, than intercommunion between Scotch and English; *secondly*, that non-Episcopal Protestants on the Continent have infinitely more excuse for their position, in consequence of the far greater difficulties in the way of their obtaining a Reformed Episcopate, than have the non-Episcopalians of this country; and *thirdly*, I would say that I know of no non-Episcopal body in the world which, in regard to the *doctrine* it embraces or allows, does not present greater obstacles in the way of full communion to the Established Church of this country than are presented by the Episcopal Church of England. I believe, moreover, that the secret or avowed use of the Church of England Prayer-Book, not only among Episcopalians, but in Presbyterian families, and especially by the ministers of Scotland, has done much, under God's blessing, to preserve this country sounder in the faith than has unhappily been the case with other countries which, since the Reformation, have acquiesced in Presbyterianism,—with Switzerland, with Holland,[1] and, speaking generally, with Germany; for it is an historical fact, abundantly confirmed by the experience of the last three centuries, both on the Continent of Europe and in America,[2] that *where there has been an abandonment of the Catholic framework of church government, there has followed also an abandonment of the orthodox faith.* And not only so. It is a fact ascertained by

[1] See No. 7 of this series, p. 387. [2] See *Ibid.*, p. 372, *seq.*

longer and more wide experience, that, where unauthorised additions have been made to the same framework, as by the usurped supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, there unauthorized additions have been also made to the orthodox faith. So mysterious and so intimate is the relation between the two!

IV. Of the Government of the Church as distinguished from Political Government.

And now I come to the fourth and last head which remains to be noticed in the passage quoted from the Moderator's address. It is in these words: "As Monarchy, Aristocracy, and Democracy are severally suited for the peculiar condition and progress of different nations in civil government, so different forms of church government may, in like manner, be suited for nations placed in different circumstances, for the more effective promotion of the sole object which such government has in view." Upon this subject, the remarks which I made in my last year's address do not seem to have fallen under Dr Pirie's notice. In that address I argued that the analogy which he adduces is not a just one upon two grounds:—(1.) Because God has not constituted States so as to form *one catholic or universal whole;* neither has He taught us that they *commit sin* when they fail to act in brotherly harmony and communion with each other. But Christ has so constituted His Church; and He has taught that sin is committed—the sin of *schism*—by the failure among Christians of such harmony and such communion. (2.) Be-

cause we know that a diversity of government among nations does not prevent them from maintaining all those friendly relations which their circumstances may require for their mutual good; whereas, on the other hand, experience teaches us that religious intercourse and co-operation do not, and cannot, take place between ecclesiastical communities for their common benefit unless their form of church government, as well as their form of Christian doctrine, be substantially the same." To those arguments I am not aware that any answer has been given.

I grant to Dr Pirie that the analogy which he draws from political government has been acquiesced in by high authorities, civil as well as ecclesiastical—for instance, by Lord Bacon,—but it is an argument which was, I believe, altogether unknown and unheard of in the Church for the first fifteen centuries. And though Lord Bacon was not unwilling to "confess," as he says, "that God had left the like liberty to the church government as He had done to the civil government, to be varied according to time," &c., yet, for his own part, he held "the government of Bishops warranted by the Word of God, and by the practice of the Church in the better times, and much more convenient for kingdoms than parity of ministers and government by Synods."[1] And he also held, *as a statesman*, for political reasons (as we shall presently see), the importance of a united Church for the United Kingdom, no less than Hooker did, *as a Church-*

[1] "Of the Pacification of the Church."—*Works*, vol. i. p. 353. On Hooker's Opinion, as quoted by Hallam, to the same effect, see foregoing No. of this series, appendix, p. 367.

man, for reasons of religion, when he wrote, "Dissimilitude in great things is such a thing which draweth great inconvenience after it, a thing which Christian religion must always carefully prevent." [1] Granting, therefore, for a moment that the argument from the multiformity and variableness of political government may be allowed to stand, are we also to concede that, within the same kingdom, one kind of government in the State can be wisely made to coalesce with a different kind of government in the Church—for instance, *a mixed political monarchy* with *an unmixed ecclesiastical republic?* Or should we not rather infer (supposing the question to be an open one) that a given species of State government would seem to call for a similar species of Church government? Yes, this is what we should infer beforehand, and this is what our own experience proves. In England, the Church Establishment, corresponding as far as may be (regard being had to the different interests and purposes of a spiritual and temporal kingdom) with the political constitution, is enabled to keep itself abreast (so to speak) of the different orders of society and to adapt itself to their several wants; [2] but it is not so in this country, Presbyterians themselves being witnesses. And the deficiency in this respect (greatly and deplorably felt, as it now is, if not by others, yet by ministers of the gospel) would be still more intolerable, were it not that so large a portion of our upper classes are led, by business or by pleasure, or

[1] "Eccl. Pol." Book VIII. c. iii. 5.

[2] (*a*) See Archbishop Trench, in "Sermons preached in Westminster Abbey," p. 14, where he speaks of the Church of England as having "continued to shape and mould for good the whole character of the English people."

by both, during a great part of the year, to reside in England. In short, had we in Scotland been living under a republic, something more might have been said in favour of a Presbyterian Church Establishment for this country, by those who are content to regard the question merely as one of expediency. As it is, however, we may conclude that not only a principle of the highest kind compels us to determine otherwise, but expediency alone conducts us to the same result.

The Moderator says, "We prefer Presbyterianism . . . as certainly most suitable *for ourselves*." But surely (unless we are content to take merely a selfish and narrow-minded view) the question ought to be, Is it most suitable *for the nation at large?* It has an obvious tendency to weaken and embarrass the Church Established in the larger and more populous portion of the United Kingdom; and in regard to its suitableness for this country *alone*, one of the ablest Presbyterian writers of the present day (not in any captious or unbecoming tone, but rather in a catholic and patriotic spirit) confesses that it has *failed* in what may not unreasonably be regarded as the first duty of a National Church Establishment, viz., "to mould the nation—people, barons, and nobles—into a religious unity;" or, as he expresses it elsewhere, "to mould into religious unity classes widely separated in material rank, and in intellectual and artistic culture." He also admits that it "was not destined to penetrate the old historical families of the kingdom."[1] When such admissions are freely made, and

[1] (*a*) Principal Tulloch. See above, No. 5 of this series, p. 259, *seq.*

from such a quarter, is there not an imperative demand upon all who desire to cultivate a spirit of brotherly love, and who are not precluded from entertaining the question by an honest, though misplaced conviction, that Presbyterianism alone is scriptural and divine—is there not, I say, an imperative demand upon all such, to consider whether a modification of the existing system might not be made, such as would suffice to remedy the disadvantage and supply the defects, of which, if Presbyterian ministers can thus speak, every Episcopalian in the country, who is driven by these defects into a position of dissent, has far more reason to complain.

Many, I am aware, will account it visionary to anticipate a time when the Church Establishment of this country may undergo a change. For my own part, I confess I have so much confidence, on the one hand, in the vital and elastic energy of what I believe to be a Divine ordinance, and, on the other hand, in the good sense and fairness of the Scottish people, that I do not despair of such an event. And surely when the fact that the change from Episcopacy to Presbyterianism was made under a very general impression that the latter *alone is taught and allowed in Scripture*—an impression which was then *studiously inculcated*, but is now commonly *disowned*—when this fact is more widely known and apprehended, a spirit of truth and candour will lead to the reconsideration of a step which, except in partial reliance upon arguments that are now abandoned, would, in all probability, never have been taken. I say "partial reliance," because I do not forget the motive prominently assigned for the establishment

of Presbyterianism in 1689—viz., that it was "most agreeable to the inclination of the people, they having been reformed from Popery by Presbyters."[1] But while I have no wish to detract from the merit of this service, I may venture to ask, Is it not time to remember also that it was by Bishops, or at least not without Bishops, that this nation was first brought out of heathen darkness? Is it not time to remember that it was from an Episcopal Church that this nation received that great gift—the translation of the Scriptures—which we all enjoy? Cannot all due honour be done to Presbyters for their services, without dishonouring and disallowing those by whom services certainly not less important or less meritorious have been rendered? Yes, surely; and for my own part, I believe that political wisdom alone, looking only to the permanency of our boasted Constitution, and the stability of the empire, would endeavour (through all legitimate means brought to bear upon the people, and especially through the dissemination of sound historical and religious knowledge) to remove the barrier which at present exists between the Presbyterian Church of this country, and the Episcopal Church of England and Ireland. "The unity of your Church," wrote Lord Bacon, addressing King James soon after his accession to the English throne, "the unity of your Church, excellent Sovereign, is a thing no less precious than the union of your kingdoms."[1] But however precious such unity may be, experience has shown that no way can be wisely or successfully attempted for effecting it,

(*a*) See above, No. 5 of this series, p. 251, *seq.*

[1] "Of the Pacification of the Church."—*Works*, vol. i. p. 351.

except through the enlightened wishes of the people themselves. And the people, I am persuaded, will wish it—as many of their Ministers, I know, already do—when they shall have been led to see how inconsistent with the will of God and with the gospel of Christ separation is; how many shortcomings of duty and how much unhappiness it entails both in families and upon individuals; how it palsies the strong arm of charity, except for purposes which are sectarian rather than truly charitable; how it chills the best sympathies and disorganises, if it does not altogether destroy, the most beneficial intercourse between rich and poor; how it prevents us, with a population so much divided, from grappling effectually with public evils of all kinds; how it tends to force minor points of doctrine into undue prominence, and, still more, to raise inferior qualifications to an undue ascendancy; how it gives advantage to impure, undisciplined living, to restless scepticism and lawless unbelief at home; and how it hinders and discourages the propagation of the glad tidings of salvation in foreign lands.[1]

Recapitulation of foregoing Arguments.

I have now gone through, as concisely as I could, and not, I am sure, in any unfair or unfriendly spirit, the observations to which our attention has been challenged by the respected Moderator of the General Assembly of the Established Church. In

[1] (*a*) See above, No. 7, p. 340, and Appendix, p. 370.

so doing, the design of my remarks has been to contribute something towards a strictly candid, comprehensive, and conclusive inquiry upon the four following points:—

(1.) Whether or no there be any sufficient ground for supposing that the several and respective powers possessed and duties performed by the three Orders of the Ministry in the Church of England and among ourselves, are essentially different from the powers possessed and duties performed by the same three Orders in the Primitive Church?

(2.) Whether or no the scriptural evidence upon the point, taken as a whole, would appear to lead to formal unity in the Church under one substantially uniform system of church government, and that system, as regards the Clergy, an organisation of three Orders?

(3.) Whether or no there be any sufficient ground for believing that the organisation of church government may safely be regarded as a thing comparatively indifferent?

(4.) Whether or no there is any ground in Scripture or reason for concluding that the organization of the Christian ministry is capable of variety, and may beneficially admit of it, no less than the organization of political government?

On a future occasion, as I have said, I shall hope to show, on the one hand, that the system of church government was uniform in the second century, and that the uniformity (exhibited in the threefold ministry) was then universal; on the other hand, that the theory which would represent this system as a corruption of the government designed and practised by

the Apostles, is a theory, and nothing more,[1]—a theory which the necessity of their position has led Continental Protestants to adopt; but which must always be painful to a humble mind, because it reflects in an unworthy manner upon the faithfulness of the primitive Christians, while it exalts the faithfulness of those by whom the theory has been introduced, and introduced not as *an incitement to future action*, but *as an apology for the past.*

It will be observed, perhaps, that I have made no remark in regard to the terms upon which such a union as I contemplate might, in my opinion, be brought about without detriment to the truth, which must be preferred to peace, and without sacrifice of the principles which, as members and ministers of the Catholic Church, we are bound to maintain. I have felt that to do so under present circumstances would be presumptuous on my part, and in respect to the matter itself would be premature. Should encouragement be given in quarters which are competent to give it, I shall be prepared, by God's help, at a proper time, to enter into explanations which would have for their object a practical conclusion, such as I would fain hope our brethren in the Presbyterian ministry would be disposed to listen to. Difficulties no doubt there must be in the way of achieving a great national benefit—a great work for God's glory, and for the consolidation and extension

[1] I have said, "a theory and nothing more," because there is *no historical record whatever* of such a change having taken place. That St Jerome's singular expression, "toto orbe decretum est," etc., cannot be regarded in that light, is sufficiently shown by Hooker, "Eccl. Pol." Book VII. cap. 5; by Bilson, "Perpetual Government," p. 306, *seq.*; and by Pearson, "Vind. Ignat.," p. 561.

of the Church of Christ; but if a heathen priest could exclaim, in the view of such difficulties,

"Fata viam invenient, aderitque vocatus Apollo,"

surely we may venture to entertain a well-grounded hope that strength and courage far more powerful than our own will not be wanting to give some effect, in God's good time, to our best endeavours and earnest prayers in such a cause.

Meanwhile, even if we ourselves should despair of seeing any substantial progress for our Church and country in the direction which has been pointed out, still it will be our duty to sow the seed which may bear fruit in a future generation; still, as the depositaries of a system which we believe to be essential to the Church's unity, we shall be bound to do all we can to recommend it by fair, charitable, and temperate argument (an obligation specially incumbent, as I think, on one placed in the position which I have the honour and responsibility to occupy), and not less by holy, harmless, Christian living, which is in the power of all, and the duty of all. In regard to the argument which you have now heard, I feel that I owe you some apology for asking your attention to an address which is suited and intended rather for another and far wider audience—an audience which I know from experience it is not possible for us to reach, except through the assistance of the public journals, courteously afforded, as it is wont to be, to the words of a Bishop delivered upon occasions like the present. I also feel with Dr Pirie that something is gained towards the promotion of the end desired by all, through the semi-official character which natu-

rally attaches to such an address; and, moreover, I venture to hope that, provided what has now been said shall have approved itself to your own judgment, as I trust it has, you will kindly do what you can, each in his own neighbourhood, to promote its circulation; designed as it is to remove misapprehensions and to justify our position in the eyes of our fellow-countrymen; before whom we claim to appear, not as sectaries to whom separation is a matter of comparative indifference, but as representatives of the Church which has been in Scotland from the beginning, once fallen and corrupt, but now reformed and purified; at times established by the weak arm of flesh, then sacrificing the advantages of establishment to supposed loyalty and truth; persecuted but not forsaken; cast down but not destroyed; "bearing about in the body the marks of the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in its body."

Removal of Disabilities in England from Scotch Ordained Clergy.

And now I must not conclude, without alluding to an event which has rendered the present year memorable in our annals, and has given additional proof of our gradual recovery, through the mercy of God, out of the low estate to which, in His judgment, we have been reduced; I mean the readjustment of the law affecting the Clergy, whom we ourselves ordain, and who may afterwards desire to minister in the Church of England. I need not repeat to you the remarks which have been so fully

made upon this subject, in their respective Synods, by the Primus and other Bishops. I concur in them all, and especially in what has been so well said by my right rev. brother in the neighbouring diocese, the Bishop (Forbes) of Brechin, whose observations I would wish to be permitted to adopt in regard to each of the topics upon which he spoke; viz., our duty of presenting thanks to those who, under God, were mainly instrumental in recovering to us rights which during the troubled times of the last century had been withdrawn; our duty of acknowledging the forbearance shown on the part of others who, though unhappily separated from us in ecclesiastical interests, refrained from opposing the object of our desire; our duty of patience under the provocation of statements made in the Parliamentary debates concerning us, from a point of view sadly narrow, and with a knowledge of facts sadly insufficient; our duty of undiminished carefulness in regard to the qualifications and title of our future candidates for Ordination; and, not least, our duty of recognising past services in the case of men who have been content to cast in their lot with our ministry, notwithstanding the disabilities and discouragements which are now removed.

I will only add to these observations the expression of my earnest hope that, nothing now remaining to prevent meritorious clergy of Scotch ordination from rising to the highest dignities of the English Church, we shall find in future no lack of indigenous candidates for holy Orders, to supply worthily the demand which is made for their services; and especially that our laity of the upper class will no

longer consider it an unsuitable destination for their sons to be bred up with the view of serving God in the noblest of all professions, any more than the gentry and nobility of England allow themselves to entertain such a thought. Sure I am, that *nothing would more conduce to elevate the whole social and religious life of this country than such a course.* It is not, indeed, for us to speculate unduly upon the future, or to covet seeming advantages which God may still see reason to withhold. It is not for us to choose to be either poor or rich, established or disestablished, times of tribulation or times of wealth, but to be contented with what He shall send us; knowing that seeming advantages will always be attended with corresponding temptations: but it is incumbent upon us, both for our own sake and for the sake of others, to do all we can to expiate and repair "former iniquities;" and to be careful above all things not to add to those iniquities through any misdoing or neglect of duty on our own part.

Just Published, Price 3d.

"DONEC PERVENIAMUS OMNES."

ON THE TRUE PERSPECTIVE OF CHRISTIAN DUTY.

An Address

TO THE STUDENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN
DELIVERED IN MARISCHAL COLLEGE HALL,
ON SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1886.

"The address is an able, eloquent, and effective appeal. . . . It is a valuable contribution to the discussions being carried on at the present time, and will be greatly esteemed by those—and they are ever increasing in number—who clearly perceive the duty of Union and the sin of Schism."—*Perthshire Constitutional.*

"The Bishop of St Andrews gave an admirable address on Sunday evening last to the University Students assembled in Marischal College. . . . Mr Cooper's sermon, preached on the same day, gives us ground to hope that the Bishop's happy suggestion for the formation of a Society for the restoration of the Spiritual Temple, with '*Donec perveniamus Omnes*' for its motto, will not be allowed to drop in the University and city of Bon-Accord."—*Aberdeen Correspondent of the Scottish Guardian.*

INTRODUCTION.

MY Synodal Address for 1864, which formed the foregoing number of this series, and which, *inter alia*, contained a summary statement of the *Scriptural evidence* for the Threefold Ministry, was not immediately followed up by the continuation which it promised, and which was to contain a similar statement of the *Historical evidence*. Before undertaking to fulfil that promise, I thought it best to allow some interval to elapse, and to devote my Address for 1865 (which may be found fully reported in the *Scottish Guardian* for November of that year) to a different subject, viz., "The position and duty of the Episcopalian Laity."[1] One of my reasons for the temporary postponement of my promised task was, that, whereas (among other censures from correspondents in the public journals) I had been accused of an inclination to lay undue stress upon uninspired authorities, as if I was conscious that inspired authorities would not serve my turn, I wished to show that I was in no hurry to pass on to the Historical evidence, but, on the contrary, desired to court the fullest ex-

[1] (*a*) That Address, like its two predecessors, gave rise to much correspondence in the public journals. Among others, a letter from "A Minister of the Church of Scotland" (quite unknown to me) contained these words: "I hope Bishop Wordsworth may live to see his noble aspirations after Unity fully realized."—*Edinburgh Courant*, Sept. 19.

amination for the argument as derived *from Scripture alone.*

On looking back now to those two Addresses, which, between them, were intended to cover the whole ground of argument, Scriptural and Historical, I feel there is one point which has not received the attention to which it was entitled. It is, I think, to be regretted that the question about which we, Presbyterians and Episcopalians, have been contending, has been allowed, by common consent, to turn too exclusively upon the claims of Parity as against Prelacy, and *vice versâ;* whereas the main element of Presbyterianism practically consists not so much in its exclusion of Prelacy as in its assertion and maintenance of a graduated system of Synodal Action; and to this Prelacy is in no antagonism. On the contrary, we may freely grant that Presbyterianism deserves no little credit, not indeed for the invention, but for the restoration, and (it may be said) the more full and perfect organisation of that system; which was known indeed and practised in the Primitive Church, but which, in subsequent times, among other derangements and disorders introduced under the Papal Despotism (whereby the Laity had been deprived of their due position, and the Clergy and the Church became synonymous terms), had lost all freedom and efficiency, or rather, for the most part, had ceased to exist. The subject will come to be noticed in one or more of the following numbers of this series; but, in the meantime, I think it desirable to point out here that, however much we may insist upon Episcopacy, or, in other words, upon the Threefold Ministry, as essential to the restoration of

Unity (on the ground both of the Scriptural testimony in its favour, and of its Historical Universality from the first down to the middle of the sixteenth century), this does not prevent us from doing justice to that feature in which many Presbyterians have considered the chief merit of their system to lie, viz., its "Church Government by Kirk Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assembly." And all that we plead for is that a way should be found by which Episcopacy may be *engrafted upon that feature*, in order to supply to the system what it now lacks, and so to render it truly Scriptural, Apostolical, Primitive, and Catholic.[1]

Regarding the subject from this point of view, it is obviously much to be regretted that Episcopacy has been judged of all along, and still is judged of, far too much from the form which it has borne in England, where it is only of late years that men's eyes have been gradually opening to the defects of their Church in regard to the matter now touched upon, and where little has yet been done to correct them. On the other hand, we would invite the attention of our Presbyterian brethren to the constitution of our own Church, since it has been free to act by itself and for itself; of the now disestablished Church of Ireland; of many of the Colonial Churches; and, most of all, of the Church of the American United States, as exhibiting features far more similar to those of *their own* cherished organisation; and we need not hesitate to acknowledge that we, Episco-

[1] (*a*) Both Leighton and Baxter argued that even the Solemn League and Covenant (which each of them had signed in early life) was not intended against *all* episcopacy. See Leighton's Works, by Pearson, vol. i. p. clxxxiii. and p. cxci.; also "Life of R. Blair," p. 362.

palians in Scotland, owe, in great measure, the advantages we enjoy through that similarity to the influence of the example which *they* have set us.

I have said that Prelacy is in no antagonism to the full development of the Synodal system as it has grown up under Presbyterianism. When the time shall arrive for such a reconciliation as that which I have advocated, there will be nothing to prevent the continuance of that system. (1.) Kirk Sessions will remain, as corresponding to our Vestries. (2.) Presbyteries will remain, as corresponding to Rural Deaneries, not yet revived among ourselves, from the scantiness of our numbers, but revived in England. (3.) Synods will remain, as corresponding to our Diocesan Synods. (4.) Above all the General Assembly will remain, only with Bishops constituting an Upper Chamber, and having the control of judicial processes. There is nothing in such a system to stand in the way of intercommunion with the Church of England, with the Irish Church, with the American Church, and with the Anglican Churches throughout the world.

The following extract from my Charge for 1865, above referred to, will shew that the subject of which I have been speaking, though (as I have said) it did not find a place in my Synodal Address, either for 1864 or for 1866, was not absent from my thoughts at that period. I was endeavouring to impress upon our lay members the duty of discerning clearly, and maintaining firmly, the principle—the only true and sufficient principle—upon which we are able to justify our position as standing aloof from the Church established by law in this country.

"I repeat that either we must accept our own system as *a Divine ordinance*, binding upon us by superior and direct obligation for the Lord's sake, or we must accept the Presbyterian system, as '*an ordinance of man*,' binding upon us 'for the Lord's sake' (1 Pet. ii. 13). There is no escaping, as I believe, from this alternative; unless indeed we have recourse to the conclusion, which many are in haste to draw, that all State establishment of the Church is contrary to the word of God; and therefore the human ordinance in this country, so far from possessing any claim to our obedience, is rightly to be repudiated. For my own part I cannot admit such a conclusion, inasmuch as I am persuaded that the principle of Church Establishment is a Scriptural one; and to abandon a true and Scriptural principle because it has been *abused*, is a policy as pernicious as it is feeble and unsound. No. What a wise and true-hearted man will aim at[1] in such a case is this—not to give up the principle, but to *rescue it from abuse*. And therefore I do not hesitate to declare we have no quarrel with the existing Church Establishment *as such*. Let it

[1] (*a*) Of course it is possible that such "aim" may be thwarted, and all hope may be excluded of removal or correction of the supposed "abuse." In those circumstances, I certainly should not be prepared to argue or to act in support of the human ordinance to the detriment of the divine one. I might remain neutral, or I might even feel obliged to act on the offensive. The evil of Disestablishment (looked at from all points of view) may become less grievous and less offensive in the sight of God than the continued persistent preference of error and rejection of truth on the part of the nation in a point so essential as the Ministry of the Church. And I am sorry to add that evidence was given of a determination to maintain that *persistency* in the proceedings of the General Assembly for the present year.

hold forth to us a standard around which we may rally, in the fear of God and with a safe conscience, and gladly will we do so, not as of choice merely, but as *of duty*, as *of necessity*. Make the standard, I would say, as you please, provided it secure to us the needful bonds of Unity, viz., the catholic Ministry and the catholic Creeds. Let the dioceses be large or small. Let there be a mixture of lay government. Let there be the use not only of liturgical worship, but (if the concession be insisted on) of prayer also, to some extent, at the discretion of the Minister. I need not say let the rights of individual Congregations be assured to them, for these, according to our present system, they already possess. Neither need I say let the exercise of patronage be so vested as to secure a due control over the appointment of incumbents, for such control is already ours. Neither need I say let the election of Bishops be open both to the Clergy and Laity of the diocese, for such our Episcopal elections now are. Nor, once more, need I say let there be legislation, let there be judicature, let there be executive administration in and by Synods of various kinds and of several degrees of power; for these, too, we already have, if not to the full extent in which they exist in the Presbyterian scheme, yet to a greater degree, and in more active force, than our Presbyterian brethren perhaps are at all generally aware. The truth is we (I mean the Episcopal Church in this country) are apt to be judged by our fellow-countrymen from a point of view which applies properly to the Church of England; whereas our system is not only free and independent of all external control, but it

approximates far more closely than the English system does to the Presbyterian platform. Our Presbyters enjoy a constitutional standing very different from the standing of Presbyters in the Church of England; and our Bishops, I verily believe,—and at least I can speak with certainty for myself,—so far from grudging to their brethren of the second Order a nearer approach to their own position, rejoice to find, by this means, their burden lightened, their responsibility shared, and their course (though it may be often imperceptibly, yet really and effectually) steadied and controlled. I point out these differences with the greater satisfaction, because they afford a decisive proof that the treatment which Prelacy has received in this country has not had the effect (which surely there might have been some reason to apprehend) of driving us to a greater distance from those at whose hands we have suffered such things. On the contrary, it would seem that we have rather endeavoured to draw towards them more closely (so far as the example of the primitive Church, which we profess to follow, would justify us in so doing); to remove what experience had proved to be occasions of offence in our brethren's way, wherever charity required and the truth would suffer us to remove them; and so to profit by the salutary, though painful and humiliating, chastisement of our past miscarriages."

CHARLES WORDSWORTH,
Bishop of St Andrews.

June 6, 1886.

"The advantages of the Episcopal form of government, which appears to have been introduced before the end of the first century, were so obvious, and so important for the future greatness, as well as the present peace of Christianity, that it was adopted without delay"—the writer, as an unbeliever, states *the fact*, but gives no higher reason for its adoption—"by *all the Societies* which were already scattered over the empire: had acquired, in a very early period, *the sanction of antiquity*: and is still revered by the most powerful Churches, both of the East and West, as *a primitive* and even as *a divine establishment*."—GIBBON, "Roman History," c. xv. 5.

"A thousand five hundred years and upward the Church of Christ hath now continued under the sacred regiment of Bishops. Neither for so long hath Christianity been ever planted *in any kingdom throughout the world* but with this kind of government *alone*."—HOOKER [1553-1600], "E. P.," Book VII. c. i. 4.

"Cling tenaciously to the Threefold Ministry as the completeness of the Apostolic Ordinance, and the *Historical backbone* of the Church."—Bishop LIGHTFOOT, "Sermon at Glasgow," 1882, p. 9.

THE MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

OUR lot, my Brethren, as members, whether lay or clerical, of the Church in this country, is one which, looked at only from a worldly point of view, few would envy. If, indeed, we could stifle in ourselves all feeling that the cause with which, under God's good providence, we are placed in charge, is not in the position in which it *ought to be* (and that, not for our own sake merely or mainly, but for the sake of the entire population of our fellow-Christians throughout the land); then, no doubt, we might pursue the even tenor of our way in simple devotion to those high duties which the profession of our holy Religion entails in common upon us all. Or again, if the Church had no history of the past; or if, amid the intricacies of that history, no clue could be found sufficient to guide us along a sure and unbroken path; then, too, we might be satisfied to labour on calmly and contentedly—you, the Laity, doing as laymen the work of good Christians in your several stations, and we, the Clergy, discharging towards you, and, so far as we may, towards all men, the higher functions of our sacred calling, in the true faith and fear of God. Or, once more, if we could bring ourselves to believe that the separation which

exists between ourselves and a great proportion of our fellow-countrymen is either necessary, or desirable, or blameless, or of small account; then, too, we might be content to remain quietly as we are, to raise no controversy in behalf of the cause which we profess, or even to abandon it altogether; although the call upon us to do so, if heard at all, would have come, not from superior station, or superior knowledge, or superior intelligence, but from that which is the weakest and least satisfactory criterion of all in such a question, viz., from superiority of numbers only. But now, as the truth of the case actually stands, all this which has been supposed, is directly otherwise. And yet, let me from the first distinctly say that in venturing once more, as I shall presently do, to speak of matters which imply a far wider consciousness than relates to ourselves only, and to suggest responsibilities which arise not merely from an appreciation of the present, but from a remembrance of the past, I would not have you for a moment to suppose that I am inclined to forget or disregard the duties which concern us more directly, and which, more immediately, lie (so to speak) about our feet. No. On the contrary, I feel as strongly as any one can, that nothing but mischief must arise if I were to allow in myself, or seek in any way to encourage in you, a disposition to look abroad for matters or occasions on which to exert our efforts and display our zeal, without having first secured the performance of that which appertains to us each to do in his own proper sphere of domestic and of social or official life. Above all, I would desire to impress upon my Clerical Brethren how indis-

pensable it is that we, if we are to challenge in God's name for the system which we profess, the position which, as we believe, He intended it to occupy—how indispensable, I say, it is that we should be found "faithful and wise stewards" of that system, exemplary and efficient in our own persons, and qualified not by zeal only, but by prudence, by knowledge, by peace and harmony among ourselves, by brotherly love both among ourselves and towards all men, to adorn the doctrine and discipline which it is alike our duty and our privilege to recommend. More than this. We cannot hope to take part with any good effect in controversial argument, unless we study to avoid all unkind reflection upon others, all personal animosity; and unless we cultivate and express (as far as we may) respect and esteem for those from whom love of the truth, as we believe, compels us to dissent. Nothing can be more alien from the spirit of the Gospel than a disposition to show scorn and contempt towards those whose conduct or opinions we feel called upon to censure; nothing more inconsistent with the first principles of just and honest behaviour than to censure rudely and rashly, or without full and accurate knowledge of the circumstances of the ase about which we presume so to speak or write.

Preliminary Remarks—Confirmation—Ritual and Doctrinal Controversy.

The many excellent volumes intended to serve as guides or manuals upon the ordinary duties of the

ministerial office, which have been put forth from the press of late years, render it less needful for a Bishop, on an occasion like this, to direct his remarks, as was formerly the practice, to such topics. There was a time indeed, and not long since, when the literature of the Anglican Church, while admirably rich in other departments, was somewhat deficient in that which has been called, not perhaps very correctly, *Pastoral Theology*. It possessed, indeed, "The Country Parson" of George Herbert, the "Pastoral Care" of Bishop Burnet, and the "Parochialia" of Bishop Wilson — works which (especially the first and last) will never be out of date. But it is one of the most precious fruits of a more earnest and devoted attention to all matters of a sacred or ecclesiastical character, that we are now enabled to point to a long list of similar publications, produced within the last half century, and all possessing more or less value in their several kinds, while among them they represent almost every shade of theological opinion which the Church admits. Such are (to place them in chronological order) Mr C. Bridges on "The Christian Ministry;" Mr Hugh Rose on "The Commission and consequent Duties of the Clergy;" Mr Evans's "Bishopric of Souls;" Mr Monro's "Parochial Work" and "Sermons on the Ministry;" Mr Heygate's "Probatio Clerica;" Bishop A. P. Forbes' "Memoriale Vitæ Sacerdotalis;" Professor Blunt's "Duties of a Parish Priest;" Bishop S. Wilberforce's "Addresses to Candinates for Ordination;" Mr A. Oxenden on "The Pastoral Office;" Archbishop Whately's "Parish Pastor;" Mr J. H. Blunt's "Directorium

Pastorale;" Mr Burgon's "Treatise on the Pastoral Office." And this richness of our Pastoral Church Literature, while it renders us the more inexcusable if we either misapprehend or neglect our duty, presents a favourable and remarkable contrast with the barrenness (so far as I am aware) of the literature of every denomination of Presbyterianism in the same respect.

In regard, then, to the general performance of your clerical functions, it may suffice, I would hope, to have referred you, my Rev. Brethren, for instruction and for guidance (so far as they may be needed) to the several works which I have just named, and with some one or more of which, I doubt not, most of you are already well acquainted. There is, however, one department of your duty, the absence of which from the Presbyterian system gives it by comparison a more prominent place, and a more especial value among ourselves, and which it is desirable, therefore, that I should touch upon for a moment more particularly. I allude, as you may suppose, to the ordinance of Confirmation, and to your responsibilities in connection with it.

Allow me then to say further, that as there is no more effectual instrument of the Church's cause in this country, as regards both the welfare of the body and the edification of individual members, so I consider there is no better test of pastoral faithfulness and efficiency, than the diligence with which you seek out and prepare candidates for the administration of that holy rite; while my own readiness to come to you severally for the purpose, whensoever you may have occasion to desire my

services, is understood, I hope, by you all, as designed to afford you in the matter the utmost assistance and encouragement which it is in my power to give. And the observance of this ordinance is a point upon which you may safely challenge for our own system the fullest examination, and the most jealous comparison with the system which, in "condemning Episcopacy," was content, as was avowed in 1638, that Confirmation also should, as a necessary consequence, "fall to the ground."[1] You may show, as I do not doubt you are accustomed to do, most conclusively, that our rule and practice in this respect rest unquestionably upon Scriptural authority and upon Apostolic example. You may produce the testimony even of St Jerome (of all the Fathers the one supposed to be least favourable to the claims of Prelacy) in declaring that the laying on of hands by the Bishop, with solemn prayer and benediction, is a usage which would be binding *on the score of its universality*, even if Scripture had not virtually enjoined it. His words are, "Etiam si Scripturæ auctoritas non subesset, totius orbis in hanc partem consensus instar præcepti obtineret."[2]

There is one other point which may seem to require to be briefly mentioned in these preliminary remarks. I refer to the satisfaction which I feel, and would desire to express, that little or no evidence has appeared among ourselves of the existence either of that controversial spirit concerning matters of Church Ritual, by which so much

[1] Acts of General Assembly, p. 20.

[2] Adv. Luciv. c. ix. Vol. ii. p. 164, *seq.*

agitation and anxiety is at present caused among our brethren in the South; or of that far graver and more painful cause of alarm which has shown itself there, and elsewhere, in the production or favourable reception of works savouring, more or less, of a semi-infidel character, and calculated to undermine our faith in the revealed Word of God. At the same time, on the one hand, we are visibly improving, I trust, in a due regard for all the essentials of propriety and reverence in the public celebration of divine worship; and, on the other hand, I should be sorry indeed to think that we are unwilling or unprepared for the pursuit of any study which the interests of truth demand, or for the fair and conscientious examination of inquiries which the progress of earthly science naturally provokes, or the speculations of a mere human philosophy may reasonably suggest.

In alluding to the controversy upon Church Ritual, I am reminded of the Report concerning it recently drawn up and adopted by the Lower House of Convocation in the Province of Canterbury. That Report embodies a remark which, valuable and important as it is for the Church of England to consider, is of still greater moment to ourselves. The words are these:—"Great as is the value of those ancient ritual usages which the Church of England has inherited from undivided Christendom, and the retention of which may hereafter be found to conduce materially to the restoration of Unity, it must, nevertheless, be carefully borne in mind that the national Church of England has *a holy work to perform towards the Nonconformists of this country*,

and that every instance, not only of exceeding the law, but of a want of prudence, and tenderness in respect of usages within the law, can hardly fail to create fresh difficulties in the way of bringing back to our Church those who have become estranged from her communion."

The "holy work" thus referred to is, I need scarcely say, required in this country even more than in England; and the performing of it, if it is to be done at all, appertains, as I just now intimated, to ourselves—that is, to the Church of which we are members. For it is not to be supposed that the framers of that Report looked merely to the accidental and (as history shows) variable standing-point of National Establishment, and not mainly, if not exclusively, to the essential and unvarying standing-point of the Truth. And the standing-point of the Truth which belongs to the Church of England, belongs equally to our own Church. Hence it is that one of the chief duties of a Scottish Bishop at the present day is, as I conceive, to endeavour to prepare the way for the performance of that great and "holy work;" and all the more when we take into account that no inconsiderable portion of the Nonconformity existing in England, as it originally sprang from the Presbyterianism in this country, so it is still derived and sustained from the same source. Nor have I attempted to disguise that my main object in the addresses which I have delivered on these synodal occasions, now for several years in succession, has been, not so much to put you, my Rev. Brethren, in remembrance of the strength and justice and necessity of our position, and so to

encourage you in the discharge of duties which often present themselves, I know, in a singularly depressing and disheartening form—my object, I say, has been not so much to serve this purpose (because, I trust, you will of yourselves have learnt *where* to look for comfort and support of a higher kind), but rather to endeavour, through the assistance which the public press has been wont to give to the circulation of such addresses, to introduce the light of Truth into many quarters from whence it has been too long excluded. Not that such exclusion is, in the main, intentional or voluntary; but it has arisen, naturally, under the influence of hereditary prejudice and of old antipathy, cherished upon grounds which happily have now for a long time ceased to exist. Nor can you fail, I am sure, one and all, Clergy and Laity, to sympathise with me in this attempt, when you observe that, while so much has been done (though still, we must hope, not designedly) to pervert and misrepresent the truth as regards our Church, not only in so-called histories for the young, and other such-like publications, but in authorised tracts, and even in formularies of religion, such as the Catechism of the Free Church;[1] while so much, I say, of misrepresentation passes everywhere current throughout the land, little or nothing is undertaken on our part to correct the evil, to expose the wrong, or to prevent the minds of those who have no wish to be misled, from falling into errors—often very gross errors—unfair to us and injurious to themselves.

[1] See above, No. 8, p. 420.

Main Subject of the Address.

With this frank avowal, then, of my present aims, and not, as I trust, without your patient indulgence, of which, I am conscious, I shall greatly stand in need, I proceed to devote the substance of this Address to the fulfilment of the promise which I made, you may remember, two years ago. That promise was to the effect that the Scriptural argument then drawn out should (with God's help) be followed up, at a future opportunity, by a survey of *the evidence which we derive from uninspired authorities and from the history of the Church;* in order to show that the same organic structure of a threefold ministry, which a candid examination of the New Testament had enabled us to discover with sufficient clearness, as time went on, spread itself uniformly throughout Christendom (with no sufficient cause, except its Scriptural and Apostolic origin, to account for its extension), and existed universally down to the middle of the sixteenth century.

Jerusalem and Ephesus—Typical Examples of the Threefold Ministry.

To begin, then, with Jerusalem itself, the original metropolis, or mother city, of all the Churches. It was shown, in my Address for 1863, and still more fully in the succeeding one,[1] that no satisfactory account can be given of several passages of the Acts of the Apostles and of St Paul's Epistles in which

[1] (*a*) See Nos. 7 and 8 of this series.

the name of "James" occurs, except upon the explanation which Church history supplies, and which is supported by the most ample and independent testimony of various early writers—viz., that the said James was appointed by the Apostles, if not by our Lord Himself, the first Bishop of Jerusalem. And the Episcopal succession in that See, beginning with James, is traced, as we know, from Bishop to Bishop, by Eusebius, the ecclesiastical historian, down to his own time, in the early part of the fourth century. At the beginning of the fifth century, the See became the head of a Patriarchate, and as such, though in anomalous circumstances, it still exists.[1]

Next to Jerusalem, of the Churches of Asia, Antioch and Ephesus occupy the most prominent place. I take the latter city first, because we learn more particulars concerning it from the New Testament, and because St Paul, the great Apostle of the Gentiles, appears to have made it the chief scene of his ministry, as the other Apostles had made Jerusalem, in the first instance, the chief scene of their ministries; and as Jerusalem, under James, was built up by them as a model of a Christian Church formed out of Judaism, so Ephesus, under Timothy, was built up by St Paul as a model of a Christian Church, formed, for the most part, out of heathenism. The idolatry of Diana, "the great goddess whom all Asia and the world worshipped," together with the size and importance of the city itself, were the main reasons, we may suppose, which induced St Paul to labour there continuously for a longer time than he did (so far as we read) at any

[1] See Neale's "Hist. of Eastern Church," vol. i. pp. 157-60.

other place, not even excepting Rome.[1] And, like a wise master builder, he saw that the foundation must be strongly laid before he could venture to raise the edifice to its full height. It is remarkable that he did not go nor preach there at all, until the Holy Ghost suffered and directed him so to do; that, at his first visit, he remained only a few days, although *the Jews* who had heard him in their synagogue, most unusually "desired him to tarry longer time with them;" that the way for his subsequent preaching there was prepared by Apollos, a Jew of Alexandria, and partly too by Aquila and Priscilla: that when he did come to them again, as he had promised, he continued with them "by the space of three years," in the course of which period he laboured so indefatigably and so successfully, that "all they which dwelt in Asia" (that is, the Lydian "Asia," of which Ephesus was the capital) "heard the word of the Lord Jesus:" and his influence spread even among the higher ranks, so that "certain of the chiefs of Asia" (literally "the Asiarchs," *i.e.*, the presidents of the games at Ephesus) became "his friends."[2]

After such a full and continuous preparation, the Church in that city was ripe for a settled ministry; first, in a less perfect form, and five years afterwards in a form thoroughly organized and complete. And it is worth while to observe that we find no distinct mention of the different steps of this organization as introduced at Ephesus, any more than we found mention of them as introduced at Jerusalem

[1] Acts xx. 31, compared with xxviii. 30.

[2] See Acts xvi. 6; xviii. 20; *Ibid.* 24, 28; xx. 31; xix. 20; *Ibid.* 31.

(except in the case of the seven deacons), but in both instances alike the facts, as they existed by Apostolic (and may we not add, therefore, Divine?) authority, are placed before our eyes, and we are left to draw from them the conclusions to which they point. At Ephesus, then, we see, first, a body of Presbyters, or Clerical Elders, to whom, as they are reminded by St Paul (himself the Head, but necessarily non-resident, *Overseer*), the Holy Ghost had in their ordination — ordination which doubtless they had received not from one another, but from him—committed "oversight," not, again, of one another, but of the Ephesian (or rather, perhaps, I should say, the Lydian) "flock."[1] About five years later we see, from the First Epistle to Timothy, that St Paul had placed that chosen fellow-labourer there to *reside*[2] as Head-Overseer or Bishop, and in that capacity to ordain[3] and perform other acts[4] such as we consider to belong especially, or exclusively, to the episcopal office; including, not improbably, the consecration of other Bishops.[5] At all events, we see plainly mentioned in that Epistle, Deacons and Clerical Elders,[6] who, with Timothy as Bishop, complete the orders of the threefold ministry. Again, nearly forty years after that Epistle was written, but still within the limits of Scriptural testimony, we find in the Book of Revelation Ephesus mentioned as the first of the Seven Churches of Asia, and a successor of Timothy, if not Timothy himself, addressed as the "Angel," or

[1] See Acts xx. 28. [2] 1 Tim. i. 3. [3] *Ibid.* v. 22.
[4] 1 Tim. i. 3, 4; v. 17, 21.
[5] 1 Tim. iii. 1. Comp. Bp. Pearson, "Vind. Ignat." Lib. ii. c. xiii. Vol. ii. p. 571, *seq.* [6] 1 Tim. iii. 8; v. 17.

chief Pastor of that Church.[1] Next, descending into the region of non-inspired authorities, such as we depend upon for all secular history, in the Epistle of St Ignatius to the Ephesian Church, we find Onesimus spoken of as Bishop of Ephesus, and moreover we see that he had under him Presbyters and Deacons.[2] Again, before the close of that second century, about A.D. 190, we learn from Eusebius,[3] that a Synod was held at Ephesus when Polycrates was its Bishop, to protest—and they did protest most strenuously — against the proceedings of Victor, Bishop of Rome ; an example which proves that in that early age the Church, while it admitted the just claims of Prelacy, did not acknowledge the pretensions of Popery. And once more : among the acts of the fourth General Council held at Chalcedon in A.D. 451, it is recorded that a dispute having arisen as to the right of consecrating a Bishop to the See of Ephesus, then vacant, whether it might be exercised by that present Council, or whether it properly appertained to the Provincial Synod of Asia, one of the speakers in the debate, Leontius, Bishop of Magnesia, stated as a fact that "from holy Timothy to their own time there had been twenty-

[1] (*a*) "Bishops, under the name of Angels, were already instituted in the Seven Cities of Asia. See Introduction to the Apocalypse." —Gibbon's "Rom. Hist." chap. xv. 5, note.

[2] See chap. i. (retained in Syriac version) ; chap. iv. and chap. ii.

[3] (*a*) "Hist. Eccles." Lib. v. c. 24. In that Epistle Polycrates mentions that he had seven relatives who were Bishops. He also names Polycarp as Bishop of Smyrna ; Thraseas as Bishop of Eumenia ; Sagaris as Bishop, apparently, of Laodicea ; and inferentially also, Melito as Bishop of Sardis. See Bp. Lightfoot, "Apost. Fathers," pt. ii. vol. i. p. 379.

seven Bishops of that See, and that all of them had been consecrated in Ephesus itself:"[1] so that the Episcopal succession had been kept up there from Timothy[2] downwards, just as from James downwards it was kept up at Jerusalem.

The city and the Church of Ephesus are now both extinct. The same may be said of Laodicea, and, in a less degree, of three others of those Asian Churches addressed through their respective "Angels" by St John, viz., Sardis, Pergamos, and Thyatira; but not of the two whom alone, among the seven, he was ordered to commend, viz., Smyrna and Philadelphia. At Smyrna (where Polycarp, a disciple of St John, was, we know, Bishop about A.D. 100, so that he may have been the "Angel" of that Church addressed in the Apocalypse), and likewise at Philadelphia, a Church has been preserved, with its Bishop, clergy, and laity, in unbroken succession, I believe, from the time of St John to the present hour.[3]

Early Universality of the Threefold Ministry.

Together with the Church of Ephesus, I mentioned, you will remember, that of Antioch as possessing

[1] Labbe, "Concil." vol. iv. p. 700.

[2] That Timothy was ordained Bishop of Ephesus by St Paul (besides the evidence produced above), is attested by a succession of early witnesses similar to that produced below in proof of the Episcopate of St James at Jerusalem. Eusebius, Jerome, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Hilary the Deacon, Theodoret, and others, afford no less than *twenty distinct testimonies* to that effect.

[3] (*a*) See Chandler's "Travels" (1775), vol. i. p. 313; Arundell's "Visit" (1828), p. 169, *seq.*; Palmer's "Dissert. on Eastern Church," (1853), p. 334, *seq.*

similar and therefore very prominent claims to our regard. But of Antioch the notices which we meet with in the New Testament are far more scanty. In Jerusalem and in Ephesus, as I said before, we have had once for all our *Scriptural models*, both amply sufficient, of a Church built up for *converted Jews*, and of a Church built up for *converted Gentiles*, upon precisely the same plan, though under circumstances most dissimilar both in regard to their previous history, and to their abiding worldly position. In regard to other primitive and Apostolic Churches, we must, for the most part, gather the evidence which is to satisfy our judgment upon the question before us, in the same way as we gather the evidence which is sufficient to satisfy us upon other points of antiquarian or historical investigation; only, in the present case, we are also bound to take with us principles, such as those of *Unity* and *Uniformity*, which the Scripture lays down, to guide and assist us to the discovery of the Truth. But in the two Churches which I just now specified, we have our instances of what Dr Candlish (in speaking of the ground of obligation to observe the Christian Sabbath), has well called "authoritative example."[1] Nor will it be amiss to add here, what I have before quoted elsewhere, the forcible language of Dr Cand-

[1] The passage referred to is as follows:—"If the institution [of the Sabbath] was to continue, with some slight change, yet *in substance the same*,"—which is also the case of the Christian Threefold Ministry, as the continuation and perfection of the Jewish—"there was no need for any *express intimation* to that effect; and good reason might be shown for our Lord and His Apostles abstaining from any *formal peremptory injunction* on the whole subject, and trusting rather to the effect of *authoritative example*."—(From a Lecture as reported in the *Scotsman*, Jan. 22, 1866.)

lish's predecessor, the late Principal Cunningham, to the same effect:—"I maintain," said he,[1] "as A GREAT PRINCIPLE, that we are bound to *receive* and *act upon* whatever can be deduced from Scripture by just and necessary consequence. Scripture is constructed upon the principle of testing men's simple and honest love of truth. . . . Hence it gives in many cases *not formal and explicit deliverances*, not overwhelming evidence which no man can refuse to accept, but sufficient evidence, sufficient materials to enable any one who *examines the whole matter* impartially, to see what the mind and will of God has substantially revealed."

Now apply this principle, so admirably stated, to the question before us, and what will be the result? It has, I think, been made apparent to men of truth-loving and impartial minds, that Scripture shows to us a Church at Jerusalem organized by the original Apostles under a threefold ministry, and a Church at Ephesus subsequently organized by the great Apostle of the Gentiles under a similar ministry; not to lay stress upon instances less perfectly exhibited, as of the six other Churches of Lesser Asia, or of the Church of Crete. On the other hand, we have *no evidence, in Scripture, of a Church administering its affairs under a system of parity in the ministry.* In such a case it is idle to appeal to Churches unsettled, or in course of settlement, and still under formation in the hands of the great master-builder—Philippi, or Corinth, or Antioch, or Rome, as they severally

[1] In a speech delivered at a public meeting in London, to oppose the Bill for legalising Marriage with a deceased Wife's Sister, April 12, 1861, and reported at the time in the public journals.

appear in the New Testament, and not as we know, or have good reason to believe, that they became when settled, before the end of the first century, and therefore before the death of St John.

You will appreciate the drift and cogency of these last remarks, when I proceed to point out that in the New Testament we have no historical mention of Antioch after the year 51; that we have very little mention of Rome, and that occurring only between the years 58 and 63; and that we have no mention at all of Alexandria. When, therefore, in writers of the highest human authority upon matters of history and chronology, we find first Euodius, and then Ignatius, placed as the first and second Bishops of Antioch in the latter half of the Apostolic age; when we find, under the year 66 or 68, Linus placed as Bishop of Rome, and succeeded by Clemens, who was succeeded by Anacletus, who was succeeded by Euaristus, all before the end of the same century; when we find Annianus placed as Bishop of Alexandria, in the year 63, who was succeeded by Abilus in the year 85, who was succeeded by Cerdon in the year 98;—when we find these things, it cannot be said that we find statements which in any instance clash with, or tend to invalidate statements of the sacred record, but only such as fairly, harmoniously, authentically supplement and illustrate the statements of that record. And in each of these cases, which represent the three great divisions of the world as then known—Asia being represented by its capital Antioch, Europe by its capital Rome, and Africa by its capital Alexandria—in each of these, amid all the secular changes and revolutions which they have

severally undergone, the succession of Bishops has been kept up more or less regularly from the first century to the present day. And to preclude all possibility of misunderstanding, let me add that these Bishops *from the first* were Prelatical Bishops, having Presbyters under them. What we know of Jerusalem, what we know of Ephesus, from the New Testament, and what we know of Rome from early ecclesiastical history, may be taken as specimens of the rest. For instance, in the Roman Church we know there were forty-six Presbyters under Bishop Cornelius in the middle of the third century.[1]

Such, then, are the great trunk lines (so to speak) of historical proof manifest in the succession of the chief original and central Sees—Jerusalem, Ephesus, Antioch, Alexandria, Rome; and, afterwards Constantinople. But it is not merely in these primary centres of life and civilization that our evidence lies. It gravitates, indeed, towards those centres; it is sustained, and it is manifested, for the most part, more perfectly in them from the very first; but it assumes a force far more conclusive when it enables us to show how complete, how universal was the diffusion of the same system wherever the preaching of the Gospel took firm root, and was followed by the introduction of a settled ministry. In passing on from the first to the fourth century, what is the spectacle which presents itself to our view? We see within the Patriarchate of Antioch, including Mesopotamia, 87 Bishoprics had been founded; in Palestine, 48; in Arabia, 21; in Asia Minor, where the dioceses were mostly small, 403; in Africa,

[1] Eusebius, "Hist. Eccles." vi. c. 43.

comprehending the six Roman Provinces, 466; in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, about 100; in Greece, and the countries now known as Roumania and Bulgaria, 145; in Italy, together with the southern part of Germany, 300; in France, Spain, and the British Isles, 210:—amounting in all to upwards of 1000 Episcopal Sees for the East, and somewhat less than 700 for the West of Christendom.[1] To attribute this universal uniformity (especially in an age of intense earnestness on the one side, and of deadly persecution on the other) to any other cause than the influence and tradition of the Apostles' teaching and authority (bidden as they were to "go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature") is a course which, at the present day, no competently-informed, or accurately-minded, or candidly-disposed reasoner will venture to adopt. And the same process went on increasing with the increase of the Church throughout the world, alike in countries subject, and in countries hostile, to the usurpations of the See of Rome—in India, in Russia, in Scandinavia, in Iceland, in Abyssinia—down to the middle, or nearly the middle, of the sixteenth century.

Aerius, in the Fourth Century, the first who questioned the obligation of the Threefold Ministry.

But there is another and no less decisive method of arriving at the truth in regard to the subject

[1] (*a*) See Bingham, Book ix. chapter ii.-viii. Gibbon, "Rom. Hist.," chapter xx., speaking of the time of Constantine, *circ.* 324. "The Catholic Church was administered by the spiritual and legal jurisdiction of 1800 Bishops; of whom 1000 were seated in the Greek, and 800 in the Latin Provinces of the Empire."

which is occupying our attention. I allude to the way in which the antagonist system—the system of ministerial parity—when it first attempted to make its appearance, was regarded in the Church. Of this we have sufficient evidence in the work which Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, the metropolis of Cyprus, A.D. 367-402, wrote concerning the heresies which had arisen both before and since the coming of Jesus Christ down to his own time. In one of the latter divisions of that work,[1] the author gives an account of a false teacher named Aerius, a Presbyter of Sebaste, in the Lesser Armenia; who, he tells us, was then still alive, and whom he describes as in doctrine "a thorough Arian," Ἀρειανὸς τὸ πᾶν. Proceeding to mention the several false doctrines which this man had broached (after informing us that he had previously been ambitious of a Bishopric, but without success), he represents him, in the first place, as teaching that "there is no difference between a Bishop and a Presbyter—they are both of one and the same order; both entitled to the same honour and dignity. By these statements," says Epiphanius, "he carried away many who accepted him as their leader." Here, then, we have a plain contemporaneous record of the first, and, I believe, the only attempt made in the Church before the period of the Reformation to reduce into one the two first orders of the ministry. And familiar as we are with the bearings of the argument, as it has been popularised in this country since the establishment of Presbyterianism, we may feel curious and interested in discovering how the same course of

[1] Hæresis, lxxv., vol. i. pp. 904-12. See also vol. ii. p. 148.

reasoning, if it deserves the name, was anticipated by this false teacher (when rankling under jealousy and disappointment) and refuted by Epiphanius fifteen centuries ago. First then, it appears, Aerius had argued for the parity of the two orders from the fact, as he alleged it, that it was competent for a Presbyter, no less than for a Bishop, to lay on hands (in Ordination), to baptize, and to perform all the offices of divine worship. To this Epiphanius replies by admitting the fact in regard to Baptism, but by denying it in regard to the *power* of ordination. "A Presbyter," he says, "may beget children to the Church by the washing of Regeneration, but not Fathers or Teachers. This can be done by the Bishop only." And as to the laying on of hands, though the writer's language is not perfectly clear, it would seem to imply that such a practice on the part of Presbyters (while generally sanctioned *then* as *now* among ourselves) indicated no more than it does with us; the *benediction*, and consequently the *ordaining power*, being reserved to the Bishop, and never bestowed by any other. Moreover, we find that Aerius, in defence of his position, had recourse to those texts of Scripture which modern advocates of a similar cause have endeavoured to turn to their account in the same way. Thus he brought forward the passage where St Paul writes to Timothy, "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, *with* (μετὰ) the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery;"[1] but he does not appear to have troubled himself to reconcile with it, or even to notice, that other passage where the same

[1] Tim. iv. 14.

St Paul, writes to the same Timothy, "Stir up the gift which is in thee *by* (διὰ) the putting on of my hands."[1] Again, he referred to the mention of "Bishops and Deacons" in the address of St Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, as a proof of the identity of the office of Bishop and Presbyter. To this Epiphanius, without entering into those remarks which a more exact criticism would be prepared to offer,[2] and which St Chrysostom and Theodoret have supplied, suggests an answer, which, whether applicable or no to the text in question, in regard to the main matter of dispute is unquestionably sound and just. He observes that "the Apostles were not able to establish all things immediately at first. In the infancy of the Church it was necessary to adapt the arrangements of the ministry, in some degree, to the fitness of the men who offered themselves, and to the circumstances of each particular case"; and "that no system in the world was ever completed and brought to perfection except by degrees."

Now, in making use of this testimony, I am far from intending to put forward Epiphanius as in all respects a judicious writer, or as one in whose arguments or conclusions it would be safe to place implicit confidence. But he was a man of competent learning and research; and it is impossible, I think, that he should have written as he has done upon this subject, that he should have given us this sketch of the position and character of Aerius, while yet alive,

[1] 2 Tim. i. 6. Scholars will know the difference in the force of the two Greek prepositions; the latter implying *instrumentality*, the former *concomitancy* only. See above, No. 8, p. 435.

[2] See above, No. 8, p. 425 *sq*.

and should have ventured to place him upon his roll of those who had introduced into the Church new and strange doctrines, partly, if not principally for the reason which I have now explained—this, I say, is impossible, unless the said doctrine had been really *new and strange*, and would be looked upon *as such* by all into whose hands his book would come. Had there been even so much as a tradition then existing among Christians that the original Ministry of the Church as founded by the Apostles had been *in any one instance* not Episcopal but Presbyterian, it is not credible that Epiphanius would have described the teaching of Aerius with reference to his advocacy of the latter ministry in the terms which he has used. "His language," he writes, "was that of a madman, rather than of one in his sound mind."

But in this matter, important as it is, we are not dependent upon the authority of Epiphanius[1] only. The testimony which he gives, and which may safely be received as representing the mind of Eastern Christendom, is confirmed by the testimony of St Augustin, writing not long after (about A.D. 428), and representing the mind of Christendom in the West. In his book, *De Hæresibus*, the most eminent of the Latin Fathers sets down the same Aerius upon his roll of false teachers, as Epiphanius had done, for this among other accounts which he

[1] Gieseler, with inaccuracy strange in itself, and strange in him, in writing of Aerius, says, in a note, "only authority, Epiphanius." Vol. ii. p. 74. Besides St Augustin, he might have quoted Philastrius, Bishop of Brescia, who in his "De Hæresibus Liber," written about A.D. 380, mentions other errors of Aerius, but omits that on Church ministry. See chap. cxxii. p. 70.

specifies, "Dicebat Presbyterum ab Episcopo nullâ differentiâ debere decerni."[1]

Evidence derived from the Councils of the Church.

There is one other species of evidence to which it may be desirable to allude, however shortly, in order to complete, so far as can be done in an Address such as this, our survey of the earlier and middle centuries—I mean the evidence which is afforded by the Councils of the Church. The list of Ecclesiastical Councils, as given, for example, in the Chronological Manual of Sir Harris Nicolas,[2] comprises not less than 1585—beginning with the Council of Pergamos, A.D. 152, under its Bishop Theodotus (who must have been a near, if not the immediate successor of the Apocalyptic "Angel" of that Church), together with seven other Bishops of Mysia, and ending with the Council of Trent, A.D. 1545-63. Now no one, I believe, will venture to attempt to show that any one of these 1585 Councils, held in all parts of the world, was an assemblage of Presbyters (with or without a Moderator), or that they were not held, one and all, by the authority and under the presidency of Bishops only. The greater or Œcumenical Councils indeed, we know, consisted, for the most part, of none but Bishops. And it is important to observe, that the first and most authoritative of these exhibit a large preponderance of Eastern Bishops. This, no doubt, is only what we should have expected,

[1] Chap. liii. S. August. Opera. Vol. viii. p. 55.

[2] (*a*) See also Harless' "Fabricii Bibliotheca," vol. xii. pp. 422-556.

and especially after the statement made above respecting the proportion of Episcopal Sees in Eastern and in Western Christendom. But the fact is important in our present argument, because it shows the fallaciousness of the attempt which has been repeatedly made, and often with too much success in this country, to excite a prejudice against Episcopacy or Prelacy, by connecting it with Popery. That there is no proper or necessary connection between the two; that Prelacy did not properly involve or lead to Popery, as the advocates of Presbyterianism, when pressed with the early universality of the Threefold Ministry, have been wont to assume or to insinuate;—this, I need scarcely say, is proved sufficiently by the earlier and more extensive prevalence of Prelacy *throughout the East; where neither the theory nor the practice of a Supremacy, culminating in one universal Bishop, has ever been received.*[1] And I may add, it was not without reason that our great Scotch Reformer, John Knox, proposed, in his "Appellation to the Nobility," A.D. 1558, to admit "the most antient Councils (in which," as he said, "the learned and godly Fathers,"—that is, the Bishops of the Church—"did examine all matters by God's Word") to be witnesses between him and his opponents "in all matters debateable," as being of themselves sufficient, in his opinion, to disprove the assumptions and corruptions of the See of Rome.[2]

[1] See above, No. 2, p. 74 note.

[2] Works, vol. iv. p. 518. See also his "Letter to the Queen Regent." *Ibid.* p. 446.

Reformation Period. Origin of Presbyterianism. Variableness and inconsistency of the sanctions upon which it has been made to rest.

We are now at liberty to pass onward, and to place ourselves at the era of the Reformation in the sixteenth century. Nothing is more true than a remark recorded of the most eminent of my predecessors in the See of Dunblane, the saintly Bishop Leighton—viz., that Presbyterianism, when it first arose, "was set up rather by accident than of design"[1]—the accident, for the most part, of an assumed necessity. It was so in Germany; it was so in Switzerland; and any one who will be at the pains to trace impartially, from first to last, the published sentiments of Luther and Calvin, will have no hesitation in assenting to the truth of what has now been said. Happily in England, the accident of this necessity did not occur; but it did occur in this country. The course of our Reformers upon the great question of the Christian ministry was not shaped by principles which previous conviction had led them to adopt; but, on the contrary, the principles which they eventually professed, were shaped by the supposed necessities of the course they took in order to escape from the usurpations and corruptions against which they had to contend. And it now becomes my duty to point out the various shifts and inconsistencies to which they, or rather their descendants, from time to time were prompted to have recourse, in consequence of having

[1] Burnet's "Own Time," vol. ii. p. 531.

committed themselves to a guidance so exceptional and insecure.

Virtually admitting their own departure from all previous usage, the first notion which our Reformers entertained was, that the policy, and therewith the ministry, of the Church is a matter which admits of change. This view was put forth in the original Confession of Faith, A.D. 1560. "We do not think," they wrote, "that any policy can be appointed for all ages, times, and places" (c. 20). Doubtless, it was, or appeared to be, convenient for them so to think. And the policy which, accordingly, they themselves adopted as best suited, in their opinion, to their own age, and time, and place, was a peculiar one; consisting of Superintendents[1] and Ministers, together with Elders and Deacons. This was the scheme of the first "Book of Discipline." But in less than twenty years it was discovered, or supposed to be discovered, that this presumed variableness of Church ministry was not to be extended so as to admit of Bishops; and consequently in the second "Book of Discipline" (1575), it was determined that their office "ought utterly to be rejected" (ch. ii.). Sixty years later, in accordance with that determination, the General Assembly which met at Glasgow in 1638, solemnly pronounced that Episcopacy was "condemned by the Acts of this Kirk as having no warrant nor fundament in the Word of

[1] (*a*) See above, No. 5, p. 242, note 1. Notwithstanding the argument of Dr M'Crie, Principal Lee, and others to the contrary, a careful examination of the "Book of Discipline" throughout will show, I think, that Knox intended the institution of "Superintendents" to be permanent.

God."[1] And this conclusion was at once entertained so strongly, that it was felt to be necessary to "extirpate" Episcopacy, not only in Scotland, but throughout the Three Kingdoms, by means of a Solemn League and Covenant; which League and Covenant, five years afterwards—viz. in 1643—the General Assembly, as we read in its Acts, "with one voice approved and embraced."[2] Thus it came to pass, that, in less than a century, the original "accident," casting off its plea of a liberal and enlightened indifference, grew into a determinate and deeply-settled design, binding upon the conscience as if by express revelation and command of God. Nor was this all. The proposed extirpation of *Episcopacy* as *unscriptural* was accompanied by the assertion of the *Scriptural* and *Divine* character, not of the previously adopted polity of Superintendents and Ministers, but of *mere Presbyterianism;* in other words, of a clerical parity with lay Elders, to be thenceforth substituted for the Threefold Ministry. In regard to this new form of "Kirk government," the members of Assembly had previously declared themselves to be "of one heart and of one soul, and to be no less persuaded that it is *of God* than that Episcopal government is *of men:*" and writing in answer to a letter from some English ministers, "they heartily wished that God would bless all Christian kirks, especially the famous Kirk of England, with this *divine form* of government."[3] The form thus referred to, however, was still "at a greater distance" from that of their Presbyterian

[1] "Acts of General Assembly," p. 10. "Baillie's Life," p. xxxviii.
[2] "Acts of General Assembly," p. 86. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 51.

brethren in England than was thought desirable by the latter; who, in 1645, when they set forth "the Directory for Public Worship" and "the form of Presbyterial Church government"—both which were approved by the Scotch General Assembly in the same year—professed, in regard to the form of Church government, that they had drawn it up so as to be "agreeable to, and warranted by, the Word of God;" but, at the same time, "in *a method of their own, without resting upon any particular model or frame whatever already constituted.*"[1] What wonder then, if, acting thus in contravention or neglect of two of the main principles which the Scripture has laid down as essential for our guidance to its true interpretation, viz., a spirit of meekness and self-distrust,[2] and a regard for the judgment and practice of those who have gone before us[3]—what wonder, I ask, is it, if, when they acted thus, in a presumptuous and self-confident spirit, a true insight of the real meaning and intention of Scripture was withholden from them? Nevertheless, the Scotch General Assembly was not content merely to approve and adopt the original and newly modelled "method" of the Westminster Divines. Two years after—viz., in 1647—writing to their English brethren, "We do not doubt," said they, "but time and experience will more and more commend, not only the beautiful order, but the great utility—yea, *necessity* of this government."[4]

[1] "Acts of General Assembly," p. 114.
[2] Psalm xxv. 9; Job v. 14; Prov. iii. 32.
[3] Isaiah xxxviii. 19; Jerem. vi. 16; Ps. lxxviii. 5, 6.
[4] "Acts of General Assembly," p. 153.

Period of the Great Rebellion—"Root and Branch Bill"—Testimony of Sir Edward Dering.

And here let us extend our view so as to look for a moment at what was passing in the sister country. Mr Hallam, writing upon the years 1640-42, observes that "few of the House of Commons, according to Clarendon and the best contemporary writers, looked to a destruction of the existing hierarchy."[1] How then came that hierarchy to be destroyed? The answer will afford a still more striking example of the want of principle—or, as Leighton represented it, the "accidental" character—in the proceedings of those who have played the leading part in the history of the Church as Anti-Episcopalians; and will serve at the same time to demonstrate still further the slipperiness and the danger, in matters of religion, of entering upon a novel and presumptuous course. I allude more particularly to the conduct of one who was a prominent actor in the scenes then taking place, and a conspicuous member of the Long Parliament—Sir Edward Dering. It was he who, as being a man of some eloquence and of a popular address, was put forward by Cromwell and the republican party to introduce—and on May 27th, 1641, he did introduce—into the House of Commons the bill commonly known as the "Root and Branch Bill," and so called because designed utterly to *eradicate*, or, as the title ran, "to abolish and take away all Archbishops and Bishops, their Chancellors and Commissaries, Deans, Deans and Chapters, Arch-

[1] "Const. Hist." ii. 158.

deacons, Prebendaries, Canons, and all their under officers." And yet the same Sir Edward Dering not long after, alarmed at the rapid rolling of the stone which he himself had been among the first to set in motion, complained that his motives in introducing that measure had been misunderstood; and, in order to vindicate his real sentiments, he published a collection of his speeches upon Church Reform.[1] In one of those speeches, not only does he describe this very measure as "a dreadful bill that had forced upon him the terror of confusion,"[2] but he enters into an able and elaborate argument in defence of Episcopacy.

"It may be thought," he said, "want of will rather than want of light which makes men deny the antiquity of Bishops in the primitive times. Therefore," he continued, "answer not me but answer Ignatius, answer Clemens, Tertullian, Irenæus; nay, answer the whole undisputed concurrence of the Asian, European, and African Churches—all ages, all places, all persons—answer all these, or do as I do; submit to the evidence of a truth."[3] And again, in another part of the same speech:—"I am none of those men who, 1600 years after my Saviour came to plant His Church on earth, will consent to give a new rule, a new invented government to that Church, never known until this age. I dare not think—who *can* think it without impiety?—that the Son of God, the wisdom of the Father, came down from heaven to plant a Church many hundred years since, and

[1] "Extracts from Speeches by Sir Edward Dering, Bart." London: 1642.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 152.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 127.

this with the dear price of His precious blood, but either never would, or never could, bless it with a good government till we were born to set it right! Believe me, Sir, believe me, the wisdom of God cannot be guilty (I speak with zeal and reverence) of such an improvidence, to erect His kingdom *then*, and to give it His rule *but now*. Take heed, Sir, and let us all take heed, of such a dangerous parity, as some would bring in among us; and the rather, because they presume to set the stamp of Divine authority upon that counterfeit metal. *Parity of degrees in Church government hath no foundation in Holy Scripture.* Indeed it is a fancy, a dream, a mere nonentity. But, on the contrary, imparity is from Divine authority. Our Saviour did plant it; and then, I am sure, it is a plant that should grow and continue."

Such was the ultimate testimony of the man who was the first mover of the bill which, for a short season, disestablished Episcopacy "root and branch" in the sister country.

Period of the Revolution, 1690.

But to return to Scotland. The basis of Presbyterianism, as re-established at the Revolution in 1690, was again subjected to a change, and a change more remarkable than any which it had previously undergone. This was owing to the policy of King William, who, maintaining "moderation"[1] with an iron hand, insisted upon the sinking of all claims,

[1] See his Letters, Oct. 17, 1690, and Dec. 24, 1696.

such as had been before put forth, of a fanatical or even of a religious character. And thus it happened that the system of Church government which had boasted so loudly of its testimony in behalf of the sole Headship of Christ, *as against Prelacy*, (that is, as we believe, *against Christ's own Institution*), was now content to derive its sanction, not from any real or pretended powers of that Headship, not from any alleged religious or ecclesiastical principle, not even from a constitutional enactment in which the Spirituality were represented or had any share, but simply *from secular and political dictation, assuming to give effect to the popular will.* But as time went on, after William's death, and still more after the union with England, anxiety was felt and shown to rectify, as far as might be, this strange anomaly: and so the standing-point of Presbytery passed once more into what may be regarded as a fourth variety, less lax and indeterminate than the position which it first took up in 1560, but also less definite and exclusive than that to which it advanced in 1638. It was satisfied to claim the authority of Scripture for its own ministry, without denying to other differing, or even discordant, forms of ministry the sanction of the same authority. By an Act of Assembly in 1711—following up a "Recommendation" made in 1705—it required all candidates for admission to its ministry to profess themselves "persuaded that the Presbyterian government of this Church is founded upon the Word of God, and agreeable thereto," and also to promise—and to the same promise candidates for its Lay eldership are also bound—that they "will never endeavour directly or indirectly the prejudice or subversion

thereof." This is the position of established Presbyterianism at the present day. It was set up as an Image, of which one foot is of clay, and the other of brass. Supported actively by the civil power, it stood for the first twenty years, almost exclusively, upon *the foot of clay*, viz., "as being most agreeable to the inclinations of the people."[1] Afterwards it was felt necessary, or at least more creditable, to add *the foot of brass*, which in all propriety should have been put forward first, viz., that "it was founded upon the Word of God, and agreeable thereto." It is now notorious that it would have been far more correct to have said that it was founded *upon the word of King William.* In the clause, as originally proposed (July 1689), of the Act "for abolishing Prelacy, and reserving to their Majesties to settle the Church government in the way most agreeable to the inclinations of the people *and the Word of God*," this latter phrase, "the Word of God," was struck out, and the Act passed without it.[2] It is right, however, to add that this position of the Establishment is one which does not satisfy the Free Church. That body (as appears from the Catechism issued under the authority of its General Assembly) has returned to the more advanced position of the Covenanters. It teaches that there is "no warrant in

[1] See "The Claim of Right," April 1689, and the Statute founded thereon, July 1689. I have said "almost exclusively," because, in the Act of June 1690, "for ratifying the Confession of Faith, and settling Presbyterian Church Government," the words "agreeable to the Word of God" do occur *in the Preamble*, in connection with "the government of Christ's Church within this nation."

[2] See Burton's "History of Scotland," vol. i. p. 190. Also Grub's "Eccles. History," vol. iii. p. 303.

Scripture for any class of ordinary Church office-bearers besides Presbyters and Deacons." This view must be difficult to receive for one who is critically acquainted either with the Old or New Testament; and when we consider the history, the teaching, and the practice of the Universal Church from the earliest times, such a view must be still more difficult to maintain consistently with a sense of Christian humility or of Christian charity. But it has at least this advantage over the two other Presbyterian theories to which I have referred. It does not suppose that so fundamental a matter as the ministry of the Church has been either thrown open altogether to our own choice, or left in a great measure indeterminate.

For ourselves, my Brethren, we cannot be a party to any of these different and inconsistent conclusions. In common with *the Church of England*, and with her sister and affiliated branches throughout the world, in common with *the Church of Rome*, in common with *the Churches of the East*—disagreeing as they all three do, to a greater or less extent, upon other points—and above all, in common with *the undivided Universal Church of the early centuries*, we hold and have ever held, without variation and without uncertainty, that there are by Apostolic authority (and therefore, we may safely infer, by Divine institution), three degrees of orders in the Christian Ministry—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.[1] It is true, individuals among us, like the Sir Edward Dering of the Long Parliament, may have wavered in this belief, or may even have gainsaid it; but they have had no authority from the Church

[1] (*a*) See above, No. 4 of this series, p. 156.

itself so to do; and the only consequence has been that they have involved themselves in inconsistencies similar to those to which Presbyterianism (as I have shown, in tracing the various stages of its history) has been continually reduced.

Presbyterianism not proved by experience to be "expedient."

But after all it may be asked, Why trouble ourselves to disturb a system which is now established, and which, while it advances no formidable or intolerant claims in opposition to other systems, appears on the whole to be sufficiently suitable for this country, and to be working well? I am fully aware that in undertaking to give an answer to this question, I set myself, if not a difficult, at least a delicate and an invidious task. But the matter in dispute being now narrowed, in great measure, to this single issue; all claim to the exclusive or even preferable testimony of Scripture in behalf of Presbyterianism being now abandoned by many of its ablest and most influential adherents; and the plea of "agreeableness to the inclinations of the people" having become manifestly obsolete in regard to a majority of the upper classes of society, and of those who have had the best means and opportunities of forming a sound judgment; when these things are so, it becomes essential to inquire how far this one remaining argument—the argument from expediency, or, in other words, from actual results—deserves to be depended on, or is capable of affording any just or satisfactory defence. In taking up this inquiry,

I entirely disclaim all purposes of mere controversy; and least of all would I willingly be thought to pursue it as though I were actuated by any self-satisfied or self-righteous spirit on behalf of our own Church. On the other hand, it must be borne in mind that, if the evidence in favour of the Divine institution of the Christian ministry in its three Orders be indeed such as I have shown it is, then the cause which we have in hand is the cause not of man, but of God Himself; and we do in a manner betray that cause, if we shrink from pointing out that there has been no true wisdom, and no true happiness, in the course which (if it were so) led us as a people to choose for ourselves in this matter, instead of trusting to the choice of God; in short, that the presumed expediency does not exist. Where, then, I must ask, are the fruits of this expediency to be seen? Can it be said that they are[1] seen (1) in the union, *actual* or *possible*, of the Presbyterian system with the Catholic Church, either of the present or of the past? or (2) in the unitedness of the Presbyterian body within itself, or in its capacity for combining or comprehending the different classes of the people who are supposed to have adopted it? or (3) in the habits of practical piety which it has fostered, or in the frequency of the opportunities which it affords for the celebration of public worship? or (4) in the reverence and

[1] (*a*) I cannot allow the following severe indictment to be reprinted without desiring to acknowledge fully and frankly that, during the twenty years which have elapsed since it was written, a marked improvement has taken place in regard to several of the particulars therein specified. Much of that improvement is due to the "Church Service Society."

solemnity with which the worship of the one day in the week which is so hallowed is actually performed, or with which even the two great Sacraments of the Gospel are commonly administered? or (5) in the honour and respect paid to the Word of God, by the public reading of Holy Scripture, or even by the public recitation of the Lord's Prayer, both of which it was, till of late years, "almost the universal custom to omit"? or (6) in the satisfaction which the system gives either to simple or to cultivated minds, by the doctrinal standards which it has adopted for their instruction and edification in the Truth, and in the knowledge of God *as the Creator of the world*, and of Jesus Christ *as the Redeemer of all mankind?* or (7) in the contributions which it has made to learning in general, or to theological literature in particular; for in almost every department of that literature, dogmatical, critical, exegetical, historical, pastoral, it has been singularly barren? or (8) in the moral condition exhibited by our population at large either in our towns and cities, or in rural districts? or (9) in the habits of reverence and respect, so essential in the upbringing of the young, or generally in the cultivation of those minor virtues, such as a due regard for decency and cleanliness, which tend so largely to the comfort and well-being of a people, and which the proverb characterises as "akin to godliness"? or (10) in the assiduity of pastoral ministrations unto the sick, the defect of which is due not (I can well believe) to want of zeal or conscientiousness in the Ministers themselves, but to the labour, needlessly and perversely onerous as it appears to us, of the preparations to be

made during the week for their Sunday services? In questioning to this extent the expediency of the existing system, I have not depended merely upon my own observation, or my own judgment. I have had in view, and am prepared to produce, the statements of Presbyterians themselves to the same effect, in as strong or even stronger terms than the expressions which I have used, upon each of these several points. It is no answer to these questions to allege that our own system has also been found practically defective in many respects. The plea we are considering is of no value unless it can be shown that the Presbyterian system is *less* defective. And it must now be added that whatever advantages we derive (as we hope and trust) from the ordinance of Confirmation, from the more frequent celebration of the Holy Eucharist, from the observance of the great anniversary festivals of the Church—Christmas, Easter, Ascension, Whitsuntide—and of the preparatory, penitential and revival, seasons of Advent and Lent—whatever advantages we derive from these, must of necessity be unknown under the system which has repudiated them one and all.

There is, then, no case of expediency to be made out in behalf of the system itself, as such. At the same time, I do most willingly and cordially admit that the same system, notwithstanding the absence of these last-named advantages, and the presence of those disadvantages which just before I ventured to point out, has been adorned by many able, many learned, many eloquent, many pious and truly devoted men, who have laboured zealously and successfully in the cause of God, and of the Gospel of Jesus

Christ. And among the humbler classes especially I do not doubt that, under the same system, through grace given to earnest prayer, to the study of God's Word, and to the observance of His day of holy rest, there have lived and died servants of Christ in a simplicity of faith and love, worthy of the best and purest ages of the Church. But am I therefore to believe, in the face of so many and great defects, openly complained of by its own adherents, that the said system has done justice either to the intellectual capacity or to the religious and devotional instincts of the people of this country? Am I to believe that the fruits of the experiment are such as to require, or to justify, the retaining of that which was originally adopted rather as an experiment than as the result of those higher sanctions which the case required? Or, what is worse (the plea of real and enlightened expediency being, in many instances, more than half abandoned, or wholly waived), am I still to believe that a case of suitableness as regards the Scottish people in particular may nevertheless be alleged in behalf of the existing system? To argue thus, as some would seem disposed to do, in the face of all the facts and circumstances which I have had occasion to produce in this Address, is to suppose that the great majority of our fellow-Christians in this country have been visited by some strange deformity of heart or head; and a deformity from which, by a Providence no less strange and extraordinary, we Episcopalians have escaped! For my own part, I see no sufficient ground either for paying to ourselves so great a compliment, or for showing so much disrespect towards those who,

unhappily, through the effect of events for which they are not responsible, at present find themselves disunited from us. In short, this last remaining plea will be wholly quashed, if I may be allowed to quote the vigorous language of an eminent living minister of the Presbyterian establishment, though writing altogether with other aims, and from a different point of view:—"We shall never," he says, "succeed in raising the Church of Scotland above her present depressed condition by succumbing to ignorant prejudice, or fostering and flattering the narrow-minded bigotries which have descended to us from rude, illiterate, and fanatical times. We have tried this too long; but we shall only fail more and more the longer we persevere in it." This is a manly and a just confession: and although it would be inconsistent with our principles to adopt the sentiment of the same writer when he continues, "We must *lean upon* the people's growing knowledge and increasing liberality;" we can at least concur with him heartily when he adds, "and we must, by all fair means, study to promote these."[1]

Reform of Worship not satisfactory without Reform of Ministry.

There is one other point to which I would wish to draw attention before I conclude. Much has been said of late, and especially among Presbyterians themselves, respecting the necessity of improvement in the matter and in the modes of their public worship. But is it to be supposed that improve-

[1] The late Dr R. Lee's "Reform, &c." Second Edition, p. 127.

ments such as have been suggested, if carried into effect, or indeed any improvements at all, however they may appear more suitable or more desirable in the eyes of the worshippers, will suffice to render the worship itself well pleasing and satisfactory (so to speak) in the sight of Him Who is the object of it, unless it is to be offered, not in violation of, but in accordance with, the ordinance which (if we are to believe the testimony of the universal Church) He has instituted for the offering of the homage which, in the public congregation, we pay to Him? The able champion of that cause, the writer of the work on "The Reform of the Church of Scotland," has not shrunk from quoting the words of St Ignatius—"Study, my brethren, to be subject to the Bishop, and the Presbyters and the Deacons; for he that is subject to them, obeys Christ Who appointed them;"—the writer I refer to has not scrupled to produce these and other words of St Ignatius, of similar tendency, only to signify his entire dissent from the conclusions to which they point.[1] But let it be remembered that the author of those words was a contemporary of St John; that his character is not only unimpeachable, but such as few Christians have ever attained; and that he suffered martyrdom under circumstances the most memorable for the testimony which he gave: let it also be remembered that his avowed object in the stress which he laid upon those directions, was not to foster any system of mere priestcraft, or of weak, unreasoning subjection to clerical authority, but to maintain and secure UNITY in the Church, according to the will of Christ:—

[1] See *Ibid.*, pp. 45, 50, *et seq.*

let these things be borne in mind, and, however much we may desire to respect the opinions of the able writer to whom I allude, we shall scarcely be prepared to think that his judgment is to be preferred to the judgment of one whose opportunities of receiving the Truth from the fountain-head were infinitely superior to those of the wisest and best informed of men at the present day. Meanwhile, we cordially and thankfully go along with Dr Lee in the Christian aspiration which he has expressed, when he writes :—"May we hope that a time will come when the prayers which each congregation offers up to the common Father, shall no longer be the Presentee's prayers, or the Minister's prayers, but the Church's prayers; common prayers in which the whole Church is already agreed, and in which all congregations in all corners of the land, from generation to generation, shall unite with one harmonious voice."[1] Only when he goes on to state, "that all the practical abuses and all the *defects* of the Presbyterian system, in respect to public worship, seem to proceed from a mistake regarding the importance of the devotional element, and particularly of prayer," (as compared with the sermon, generally esteemed, he says, "the first, second, and third thing, and, indeed, very nearly everything in our public worship,"[2])—when he states this, may we be allowed to intimate that such a representation does not appear to us fully to reach the root of the evils of which he complains? The changes which he suggests as temporary expedients are indeed generally of value, and to the purpose;

[1] See *Ibid.*, p. 77. [2] See *Ibid.*, p. 76, *et seq.*

but if the same God who teaches us to worship Him with reverence and godly fear, has, *with a view to these very ends*, ordained in the Christian, as unquestionably He did in the Jewish Church, a channel through which His public worship is to be offered; if this be so—and no candid person, taking into account both the scriptural and historical evidence, can deny, I think, that the supposition is, at least, a probable one—then it would seem that some remedy must be applied to the *self-devised and extemporaneous Ministry*, no less than to the *self-devised and extemporaneous worship*, which, irregularly indeed, but not incongruously, the said Ministry has been led to offer. Again, if it be true, as undoubtedly it is, that, according to the statement of the same writer, "the use of Liturgies, and the consequent reading of prayers, may be considered an attribute of the Christian Church in *all its branches and at all times*," so may also the use of an Episcopal Ministry; and if "the disuse of a Liturgy and the practice of praying extempore arose," as the same writer likewise has observed, "from *accidental* causes,"[1] so did also, as I have remarked above, the disuse of Episcopacy and the introduction of Presbyterianism. Other causes, no doubt, conspired with the "accident" in both instances—causes which, for the most part, it will be more charitable to consign to oblivion; but I trust there will be nothing offensive, and I am sure there will be nothing unreasonable, if I venture to extend to them *both* the sentence of condemnation which the same authority has applied only to *one*. "We are content," says he, appealing

[1] See *Ibid.*, p. 83.

in a tone of righteous expostulation to his Presbyterian brethren,—"we are content to wear still the livery of deceased superstitions! It is time, surely, we should strip off these badges, which never were honourable, but which now doubly degrade us."[1] Who can doubt that language such as this, however distasteful, when first propounded, to men of timid or less vigorous minds, is far more truly Christian than the attempt, which unhappily we sometimes witness, to throw, as it were, a halo of spurious romance, drawn from no venerable or distant past, around the existing state of things—a halo, such as shall prevent us from discerning truth from error, or, what is worse, shall render us so enamoured of error, that for its sake we are to persist in rejecting truth.

I need scarcely remind you, my Brethren, that the same object which St Ignatius had in view—viz., the UNITY OF THE CHURCH—has been my own object in this Address, as well as in a great part of the other addresses which I have delivered at our annual Synods since I became your Bishop. It has not been from any wish to dispute about Presbytery or Episcopacy, still less from any design to justify ourselves or to disparage others, that I have spoken; but from a conviction that separation among Christians, especially among Christians who are fellow-countrymen, is as harmful as it is wrong, as baneful to our happiness as it is prejudicial to our true godliness; and that it is to be healed, if at all, through the mercy of God, by a return to the means which, there is the

[1] See *Ibid.*, p. 83.

best reason to believe, He himself prescribed for this very end.

Summary of Argument in this and former Addresses.

And now, in concluding this Address, I may be allowed to sum up the main substance of the argument in very few words. On the one hand, then, we may venture to affirm that THE FACTS which prove the early universality of the Threefold or Episcopal Ministry, admit of no controversy; nor has the challenge, so often given, to discover in Scripture or in the history of the Church, from the beginning down to the sixteenth century, a single instance of settled and organized Presbyterianism, ever, I believe, been taken up. On the other hand, the controversy raised first by Aerius, in the fourth century, from a superficial view of certain well-known texts of the New Testament and of the undefined use, at the first, of ecclesiastical WORDS and NAMES, while it determines nothing, if fairly carried out, in favour of any other system, admits of an easy and obvious solution as regards our own. For instance, a change or restricted application, similar to that which the ecclesiastical title of *Episcopus* (Overseer, Bishop) underwent towards the end of the first and at the beginning of the second century, the civil title of *Archon* had previously undergone at Athens, and the military title of *Imperator* had undergone at Rome. The same may be said of *Legatus*, a title both civil and military. Again, the ecclesiastical title *Diaconus* (Minister, Deacon), though less disputed about, was used at first still more laxly, and afterwards under-

went a still greater change as confined to the third Order of the Ministry. Nay, we know that even the most holy name of GOD himself is to be found in Scripture as applied to men; and the name of the Church, *Ecclesia*, is allowed to stand in the New Testament for a political as well as an ecclesiastical congregation. If it be asked *why* the Episcopate properly so called, in succeeding, as it did, to the Apostolate, did not retain this latter name, but borrowed one which had at first been partially applicable to the second order of the Ministry, the answer is that a change of name was called for by a change of circumstances. For, first, the Bishops were no longer "*sent*," as the Apostles (*i.e.*, "the Sent") had been, "into all the world," but were confined each to his own sphere of *episcopè* or supervision; and secondly, they were not to consider themselves as an order identical in every respect with that of the Apostles; though, in all the ordinary essentials of the Apostolic office, they resembled them sufficiently to maintain *identity of descent*. This latter statement is repeatedly sanctioned not only by authors such as Tertullian, or such as St Cyprian, but by St Jerome.

On the other hand, it is, I suppose, and must be, admitted by all, that Presbyterianism has no historical basis. "This Church itself," writes the distinguished minister of the Presbyterian establishment before referred to, "is no more than 300 years old, and it has seen more revolutions than centuries." And yet there are multitudes who still believe that it is Scriptural. Nay, all its Ministers have solemnly professed their belief that it is "founded upon the Word of God and agreeable thereto." But the truth

is that these two things are utterly irreconcilable. A form of Ministry, a form of Church government, if to be found in Scripture, must also be to be found in history; because it is inconceivable that Scriptural teaching upon such a matter should have nowhere received its formal expression in the actual existence of the system itself.

And now we may see why it is that some of the most respected and most eminent of the Presbyterian body at the present day have abandoned the ground taken up in the seventeenth century, and no longer hold that Prelacy is anti-Scriptural, or that Presbyterianism is prescribed in the Word of God. Men of cultivation and discernment, they have come to perceive that it is easy to draw a single text of doubtful interpretation so near the eye as to destroy the perspective of the evidence as a whole. This has been signally exemplified within the last year by the public abandonment of the well-known text (1 Tim. v. 17) upon which the whole system of the Presbyterian eldership was formerly built up.[1] Above all, men of charity and of enlarged affections cannot bring themselves to believe that the whole of Christendom for fifteen centuries was utterly misled upon so vital a point as the institution of its clerical Ministry: and the only alternative that remained to them, unless they were to quit the system to which they had been pledged, was to fall back upon the notion which some of the first Reformers (when they broke away from the Papal system, and could obtain

[1] I allude to the Treatise on "The Theory of the Ruling Eldership," lately published by the learned Principal of the University of Aberdeen, Dr P. C. Campbell.

no Bishops of their own) had recourse to in self-defence; viz., that the matter was indifferent, and so might be capable of adaptation to altered circumstances. But though by this change of position they extricate themselves from one difficulty,—that is, they no longer appear in the presumptuous and uncharitable attitude of claiming to condemn the universal and undivided Church,—yet they are held under another difficulty no less inextricably than before: they preclude themselves from union with all bodies of Christians who are unable to acquiesce in their lax opinion; who can see no sufficient reason in the circumstances of their case, to justify their deviating from the universal rule of Christendom handed down through so many centuries from the earliest time; and who themselves, not without ample light from Scripture so directing them, regard that rule as a divinely-provided means for enabling them to fulfil a divinely-prescribed law, still more manifest — the Law of VISIBLE AND PRACTICAL UNION—so far as circumstances admit or require, throughout the Church of Christ; not holding it consistent with the wisdom or with the goodness of God, to prescribe such a law, and not withal to provide sufficient means whereby it may be obeyed.

I will only add that if to attempt to knit together once again, in the interests of our common life, the several classes of society by the strictest and most blessed of all ties, the tie of religion, be to aim at a noble end; and if to make this attempt otherwise than in accordance with what we may presume to be the will of God, be unworthy of the character of a true Christian; then I would hope I may be at least

excused for endeavouring, as I have done, to prepare the way for such reconciliation, so that others who come after us may, perhaps, enjoy what we ourselves can scarcely, if at all, expect to see. That a certain amount of temporary unsettlement is the unavoidable consequence of such endeavours, must be evident to all. But we have already the avowal of the most eminent leaders of the Establishment itself, that *some departure* from the existing order of things has become necessary; and no such movement can be satisfactory to thoughtful and well-instructed minds, or can lead to really beneficial and permanently settled results, which does not proceed upon principles recognised from the beginning, and still accepted throughout Christendom.

The following are the Subjects of this Series as already published:—

NUMBER I.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION.

NUMBER II.

OUR CHIEF DANGER AS A NATION: Its Cause and Remedy.

NUMBER III.

UNITY A DIVINE LAW OF UNIVERSAL OBLIGATION.

NUMBER IV.

PROVISION FOR OBSERVANCE OF LAW OF UNITY.

NUMBER V.

THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION IMPARTIALLY EXAMINED.

NUMBER VI.

REUNION OF THE CHURCH IN GREAT BRITAIN.

NUMBER VII.

PLEA FOR UNIFORMITY IN MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH.

NUMBER VIII.

RESPONSE OF EPISCOPALIANS TO MODERATOR'S APPEAL.

NUMBER IX.

THE MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

INTRODUCTION.

THE first conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion, home and foreign throughout the world, was held at Lambeth Palace in September 24-27 inclusive, 1867. It had been arranged that during the preceding Octave, services should be held morning, noon, and evening, at one of the London churches (St Lawrence, Gresham Street), with sermons to be delivered by Bishops who had come from the several Churches which were to be represented at the Conference; and it was desired that each Preacher should endeavour to inform and interest his audience respecting the history and circumstances of the particular Church to which he himself belonged. As the Bishop invited to perform this duty in behalf of our Church in Scotland, I prepared and delivered on Sunday evening,[1] September 22, a discourse upon the text, Phil. iv. 2, in which my purpose was to present an Historical view of the Ecclesiastical relations between England and Scotland (under the names of Euodias and

[1] Bishop Selwyn, of New Zealand, had preached in the morning. The series included also sermons by the Bishops of London, of Derry, of Dunedin, of Quebec, of British Columbia, of Newfoundland, of Barbadoes, of Labuan, of Honolulu, of Arkansas, of Vermont (senior Bishop of U.S.A.), of New York, of Grahams Town, of Cape Town, of Grafton and Armidale, of Perth, Australia; also by Bishop Twells of the Orange River Free State, and Bishop Tozer of Central Africa: —twenty Bishops in all, from as many different parts of the globe.

Syntyche), as they had been since the Reformation, as they were at the present, and as it was hoped they might come to be at some future time.

In that same year, and some six weeks after the Lambeth Conference, there occurred another highly interesting occasion, viz., the reopening of Chichester Cathedral, which was to be celebrated by a course of services and sermons during several days; and in which our present Primus, Bishop Eden, of Moray and Ross, had consented to take part and preach. Unhappily, however, only a day or two before the ceremonial was to commence, I received from him a telegraphic message, informing me that he found himself prevented by a family bereavement from fulfilling his engagement, and requesting me to supply his place. With the long journey from Perth before me, there was no time to prepare a new sermon, and I determined to make use of that which I had delivered at St Lawrence, with only such additions and adaptations as the case required. The result was the following Discourse as it now stands, and as it was preached in Chichester Cathedral, on Thursday, November 14, under circumstances of which the Reader will find some record in the short Preface, prefixed when the sermon was first published, two years afterwards; and I need scarcely say it was highly gratifying to me to find by a characteristic note received the next morning from the Dean, Dr Hook, that the duty, which thus unexpectedly devolved upon me, had been performed to his satisfaction. It began as follows:—

"Ten thousand thanks for your glorious, manly —permit me to say, English—sermon."

And it went on to relate some interesting reminiscences of the writer's own first acquaintance with Scotland in his early days as a young clergyman; ending with an anecdote strikingly illustrative of what our Church had to suffer even in the latter part of the last century; for Bishop Jolly's first ordination was in 1776.

"Bishop Jolly told me that, when he was preaching as a young man, some soldiers were seen approaching the village, and all his congregation fled, leaving him in his pulpit alone in his glory!"

In the interval between those two occurrences—the Lambeth Conference and the Chichester ceremonial—our Diocesan Synod for that year (1867) had taken place, viz., on November 7; and I had delivered an Address, afterwards published under the title: "The Lambeth Conference: its Aims and Performances; with some remarks on the Address of the Moderator (Dr Crawford) in the last General Assembly of the Church of Scotland." And this—for reasons to be mentioned presently—again carries us back to another event which had occurred in the autumn of the previous year (October 17, 1866), and which created no slight sensation throughout Scotland. The then Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Longley, had paid our Church—and the Primus Bishop of our Church—the compliment of coming to Inverness to lay the first stone of a building which was to become the cathedral of that Northern Diocese. To a well-informed and fairly-constituted mind there would appear to be nothing very strange or objectionable in such a proceeding. Dr Longley had been tutor to Mr Eden, and also my own tutor,

when we were undergraduates at Christ Church, Oxford, and from his position as Primate of the Church of England, he would naturally feel an interest in the rising fortunes of the Disestablished Sister to whom that Church had twice, since the Reformation, been the instrument in God's hands of restoring her lost Episcopate. Nevertheless the event gave rise to an amount of irritation, especially among the members of the Established Church, which, except for those who can remember the actual circumstances, it must be difficult to conceive. Even a churchman of so large and liberal a mind as the late Principal Tulloch wrote (October 24) an angry letter to *The Times* concerning it; in which he complained, "how empty is *all babble about Union* between the churches of the two countries on the part of those who have not learned even the alphabet of Ecclesiastical courtesy and national right;"[1] and *The Times* itself, in a leading Article censured the conduct of the Archbishop in no measured terms. Happily for us, *The Scotsman* took the other side, and with the superior force which fairness and consistency always give, exposed the fallacy of the objections which had been raised against Dr Longley's action.[2]

[1] And yet, if I remember right, Principal Tulloch himself, many years afterwards, did what amounted to the same thing for a Presbyterian Church in London; and no one complained.

[2] In commemoration of the impartial course taken by *The Scotsman* on that occasion, I venture to produce the following quartette written at the time, and preserved in an old MS. book of miscellaneous effusions:—

Jupiter e cœlo fulsit tonuitque sinistro
Anglus, et inde sequens nil nisi fumus erat.
Dextrorsùm at Scotus respondit Jupiter, et mox
Inde sequens toto lux erat alma polo.

There can be no doubt that the occurrence which I have now mentioned, however auspicious in all other respects, had unhappily the effect of giving for a time a decided check to the feeling and interest in favour of Union, which had been excited, and had gone on gathering strength, since the Appeal made in my "Tercentenary Discourse on the Scottish Reformation," at the end of 1860. Besides numerous letters and articles in the newspapers, the tone assumed by Dr Crawford in his Moderator's Address for the year after that occurrence, afforded only too manifestly a proof of this. And therefore it was that at our subsequent Synod in the autumn of that year (1867), having spoken of the Lambeth Conference which had then recently taken place, I went on to notice that part of Dr Crawford's Address in which he had referred in no very kindly terms to ourselves. I do not think it necessary to introduce *in extenso* the Charge in question; but being, as it was, so closely contemporaneous with the following sermon, and tending, as it does, to illustrate the stage which the movement for Union had then reached, the extracts from it which I proceed to give, will not, I hope, be regarded as unacceptable or out of place.

I began by speaking of the Archbishop's visit to Inverness as an event "highly gratifying, not only to those who had the happiness to be present, but to every member of our Body," and then proceeded as follows:—

"Infinitely less important in itself, but scarcely less gratifying as a token of the good understanding which now happily exists between our own Church and the Church of England, is the invitation with

which I myself was honoured by the same Archbishop to assist at the consecration of my friend, the late Vicar of Kidderminster, now Bishop of Rochester,[1] being the 98th in succession in that see, which has continued for upwards of 1200 years, and, next to Canterbury, is the most ancient in all England. There is, I believe, no instance on record of a Scottish Bishop having ever before taken part in the consecration of an English one.[2] And I was glad to call to mind that there are circumstances in the history of the see of Rochester which gave an especial fitness to such a recognition in that particular case. As the Cathedral Church at Rochester, in which the consecration took place, is dedicated to St Andrew, the patron saint of Scotland (from whom, moreover, this diocese derives its name), so a Bishop of Rochester, Richard Neale, was one of the four English Bishops who, in 1610, consecrated Spottiswood and his two brethren, and thus restored to us the succession of the Catholic Episcopate which had been broken off at the Reformation.[3] Again, it was another Bishop of Rochester, John Warner, who in 1667 founded four exhibitions at Balliol College, Oxford, on purpose to support the cause of Episcopacy in Scotland, when, after the Restoration, it had been a second time revived. Once more, it was the celebrated Dr Samuel Horsley, translated to the see of Rochester in 1793, who in the previous year, as

[1] Since become Bishop of St Albans.

[2] Several other instances have since occurred. Among them may be mentioned the consecration of my Brother, the late Bishop of Lincoln, at Westminster Abbey, in 1869, at which I was present and took part.

[3] See below, p. 566, note 3.

Bishop of St David's, had shown himself the champion of our Church in the House of Lords, when the penal laws, which had reduced us nearly to extinction, were first repealed.

. . . . . .

The Lambeth Conference.

"But far above all, as memorable to us, and memorable in itself, stands out the occurrence which will render the month of September in the present year illustrious in the annals of Christendom and in the history of the Catholic Church. Memorable to us, because the presence of five of our Bishops at the Lambeth Conference, and the invitation given to all, together with the due precedence accorded to us as forming a portion of the home Episcopate, after the English and Irish prelates, have stamped in a manner which leaves nothing to be added the position which we hold—not, indeed, by any temporal, but by spiritual right—among the branches of the Catholic Church, known as Reformed, and known as Anglican. Memorable in itself, because, as the Archbishop stated in his opening address, it was the first Conference that has ever taken place of the Bishops of that Church. His Grace might have added that no such Conciliar meeting, either for a secular or a sacred purpose, has ever been held since the world began, in regard to the distance traversed by those who then conferred together—a fact sufficient in itself to challenge no ordinary observation; and when it is further noticed that the purpose for which all that travel was undergone, all that fatigue, and

danger, and expense incurred, was simply and purely a religious one—called forth by no temporal authority, and directed by no merely temporal or selfish aims—when this was so, who shall wonder that an event so remarkable, so alien from all common experience in these latter days, should provoke the scorn and ill-disguised hostility of worldly and irreligious men, who feel themselves rebuked by any movement which, shaking itself free from mere secular influences, rises above the transitory interests of this present life? Such, then, being the character of the Conference, and so great the interest which it naturally excites, I venture to hope that I shall perform a task not unacceptable to those who hear me, if, having been myself present, I make it the leading subject of my present address. And the course which I shall pursue will be to point out in detail what were the principal objects contemplated by the promoters of the Conference; and then, when you have seen how far the ends for which we met were such as to justify our assembling, I shall enable you also to judge how far those ends were kept in view, and have been accomplished, or placed as much as could be in the way of accomplishment, by what was actually done.

First Main Object of the Conference.

"First, then, one main occasion of the Conference was the existing position and prospects of the Church in the various colonies and dependencies of the British Empire, and in the heathen countries

which lie beyond them. The rapid upgrowth and development of the affiliated branches of the Anglican Church is one of the most noteworthy, and, to a religious mind most gratifying, phenomena of recent times. By affiliated branches I do not mean either the Irish or our own, for both these have an independent origin, as ancient, or nearly so, as that of the Church of England itself; but I mean the Church of the United States of America; and, as now distinct from it, the Churches which we call 'Colonial,' being co-extensive with our colonies throughout the world, and 'Missionary,' when they extend beyond them. It is not to the credit of our Church and country at home that in no one instance have our emigrants been so adequately impressed with the importance of religion as a national concern, that they have cared, as yet, to give to it the established position which it occupies in the fatherland. In the colonies the political authority, as such, has not, indeed, discarded the Christianity which still sanctifies, more or less effectually, our domestic rule, but it has never owned it. This is one of the many evil fruits of our 'unhappy divisions.' But there is—or rather there was till of recent times—a greater discredit to us than this. From the period of our first emigrations in the 16th century down to the year 1784—that is, for upwards of 200 years—no attempt was made in any colony to introduce the system of the Church in its completeness. There was no Bishop, no Diocese, no discipline over Clergy, no Ordination except at home, no Confirmation. The consequence was that sectarianism in every variety of its degenerate rank-

ness took possession of the lands which Churchmen, as such, had failed to occupy:—

> '*Pro molli violâ, pro purpureo narcisso,*
> *Carduus et spinis surgit paliurus acutis.*'

"Meanwhile, the most respectable of the Dissenting bodies, such as the Wesleyans and the Baptists, being at liberty to complete their respective organizations, developed themselves into an enormous growth, especially in North America. But in the year which I just now named, there occurred an event which, looked at under all the circumstances, is certainly one of the most remarkable in the history of Christendom. The North American colonies had asserted their independence, and being now free, certain good Christians among them were determined to do for themselves what their mother Church and country had so long neglected to do for them—that is, to introduce the order of Bishops as the first necessary step towards the settled organization of their scattered flocks. But how was this to be effected? There were political difficulties in the way of applying to England, besides the mutual feelings of animosity arising out of the war in which the two countries had been engaged. They turned their eyes, therefore, to Scotland. At that time this Church of ours had been reduced almost to extinction through the long-continued persecution to which it had been subjected (not altogether without reason) at the hands of the civil power. But as at the first preaching of the gospel it pleased God to choose the weak things of the world, and things which were despised, yea, and things which in the eye of man

had no existence; so to the poor, persecuted remnant of the Scottish Church was vouchsafed the privilege of imparting to the United States, now no longer dependent upon England, the first seed of the Episcopate which England had withheld. On the 14th of November 1784, Dr Samuel Seabury of Connecticut, the first Bishop who was to set foot on the continent of North America—nay more, the first Bishop who was to go forth to any foreign land to communicate the full blessings of our Catholic and Reformed Church—was consecrated to his Apostolic office, not amid the solemn pomp and august ceremonial of an English cathedral—no, nor in the venerable chapel of an English Episcopal palace—but in the obscurity of an upper chamber of a lowly dwelling-house in Aberdeen! And what is the result at the present day? What is our condition after so short an interval? Since that time the two great affiliated branches of the Anglican communion of which I spoke—the American and the Colonial—have been running a holy Christian race—have been vying with each other in the progress of their development; and while the former, the American branch, with very slight modifications of the English liturgy and standards of doctrine, has formed itself into a consolidated union of nearly forty Dioceses,[1] with their respective Bishops, and is now, I believe, the only religious body in that country which, by gaining upon the rest, does more than keep abreast of the growth of its own share of the population; while such is the

[1] Now, in 1886, the number of Bishops of the American United States is seventy-one.

present condition of the American branch, the other —*i.e.*, the Colonial and Missionary branch—has spread itself everywhere under a similar diocesan system, now including no less than fifty Bishops:[1] and of these fifty, five have been raised to the dignity of Metropolitans, as heads of ecclesiastical provinces, which, for the sake of greater union and consistency, have been formed respectively in British North America, under the Bishop of Montreal; in Southern Africa, under the Bishop of Cape Town; in British India, under the Bishop of Calcutta; in Australia and Tasmania, under the Bishop of Sydney; and in New Zealand under the Bishop of that see.

"Consolidated as our American brethren now are, through their General Convention, into a complete independent Church, it was not any difficulty or necessity of their own that brought the members of that Episcopate over so many thousand miles of sea and land to confer with us at Lambeth. They came, indeed—nineteen in number, including their missionary Bishop to China, and with their presiding Bishop at their head, a venerable man well stricken in years—they came from all parts of the United States—from the North and from the South—as from Massachusetts and New York, so from Texas and the Indian territory—but they came, for the most part as desiring only to bear the burdens of others; to testify the sincerity of their fellowship with us, and their determination to maintain it; to aid us, if it might be, by their common counsels—in a word, they came from no other motive but

[1] Now, in 1886, the number of English, Colonial, and Missionary Bishops is eighty.

Christian sympathy and brotherly love. It was not so, however, with that other great affiliated branch which remains more closely connected with the root from which it sprung. As was to be expected in course of time, doubts and difficulties of various kinds—not in one country only, but in different quarters of the globe—have arisen, more or less, in regard to the relations existing, or which ought to exist, between the Voluntary Churches in our colonies and the Established Church at home; and also to some extent in regard to the relation of several of the Colonial or Missionary Churches towards each other. Our brethren, the Clergy and Laity of the Colonial Church, have shown no disposition to act impatiently, or to bring about a separation from the Mother Church in a spirit of self-will; but, on the contrary, while they properly claim for themselves such amount of liberty as is necessary to enable them to discharge the duties, each of its own peculiar position, for the good of its own people, with full effect; they are no less anxious to avoid the danger of drifting apart from their common anchorage in the same standards of Faith, the same order of Ministry, the same method of Worship; they are no less desirous to maintain as far as possible the spiritual ties which connect them with the Church at home, and with the other Reformed Churches in communion, like themselves, with the Church of England. This, then, as I have said, was one great object of the Conference. Is it possible to conceive a worthier or a more momentous one, when we consider that the system of the Anglican Church is spreading like network over the

face of the whole earth; that it constitutes confessedly the noblest embodiment that has yet been seen of the principles of the Reformation; and that it forms the only sufficient barrier against the despotic ascendancy of Popery on the one hand, and the spread of endless divisions and sectarianism on the other? And in order to carry out this object a committee has been appointed, comprehending representatives of each of the five sections of the conference—English, Irish, Scotch, Colonial and American—with instructions to consider and report upon the organization of a scheme embracing, as we conceive, the best means whereby the said object may be obtained.

Second Main Object of the Conference.

"A second great end which the Conference had in view was to warn the members of our Reformed Church against the dangerous and seductive errors which some of late years have failed to perceive sufficiently; and especially to re-assert the faith in God's written Word, as we have ourselves received it. This has been done in part by the unanimous adoption of the Pastoral Letter which, I conclude, you have all heard or read, and in which you have been exhorted and entreated 'to hold fast, as the sure Word of God, all the canonical Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament,' 'to seek to know more of the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour, very God and very Man, ever to be adored and worshipped, Whom the said Scriptures reveal unto us;' and 'to guard yourselves and yours against corruptions of

the truth,' and particularly those two corruptions which are named as maintained and practised by the Church of Rome—one of which has been the main original cause of the chief divisions now existing in the Church of Christ; and the other goes directly to destroy the most essential foundations of the Christian faith. And further, the same end of warning, and of guidance has been effected by the single exclusion from the Conference of the misguided man who, having made himself most notorious by his attacks upon the inspired Word, was deemed not worthy to be admitted to communion with his brethren; and affected, still more, by a resolution passed, which virtually secures his supersession from the office he has betrayed, and repeats the decision which was pronounced of old—'His bishoprick let another take.'

Third Main Object of the Conference.

"A third chief motive which alone would have sufficed to justify our assembling was a desire to take advantage of the deep and widespread sense *of the evils of separation* which God has recently awakened in the minds of many, in order to point out the only sure means for maintaining Unity among ourselves, and of restoring it in our relations to others with whom unhappily we are not now in visible communion. It is with this object in view that the Pastoral Letter prays that 'God in His good time would give back unto His whole Church the blessed gift of Unity in Truth.' Moreover, it exhorts — 'Hold fast the Creeds, and the pure Worship and Order'—that is, more especially the

holy Order of the Ministry—'which of God's grace ye have inherited from the Primitive Church. Beware of causing divisions contrary to the doctrine ye have received. Pray and seek for unity *among yourselves*, and *amongst all the faithful in Christ Jesus*.' Several resolutions were passed for securing especially among ourselves — that is, among the Churches of the Anglican Communion—the practical accomplishment of these precepts. Nor was this all. Among the very first acts of the Conference, and as introductory to all the rest, in carefully weighed and comprehensive terms, we have pointed out still more fully the course which, in our opinion, must be observed by those who heartily and honestly desire to advance the holy cause of the visible Unity of Christ's Church on earth. The declaration to which I refer is in these words. After expressing 'the deep sorrow with which we view the divided condition of the flock of Christ,' it proceeds—'We do here solemnly record our conviction that Unity will be most effectually promoted by maintaining the Faith in its purity and integrity, as taught in the Holy Scriptures, held by the Primitive Church, summed up in the Creeds, and affirmed by the undisputed General Councils; and by drawing each of us closer to our common Lord, by giving ourselves to much prayer and intercession, by the cultivation of a spirit of Charity, and a love of the Lord's appearing.'

A Cause for Regret suggested by the Conference.

"Such, my brethren, are the chief ends which the Conference had in view, and such the means whereby

it has sought and is seeking to attain them. As to the proceedings themselves, all who were present would give you, I am persuaded, but one and the same report of them—viz., that (as the final resolution solemnly declares) they 'were conducted in a spirit of brotherly love.' There was, indeed, one circumstance which, however it may have escaped the observation of others, gave me, I must confess, deep concern. Coming as I had done from this northern portion of Great Britain, I could not but reflect that the religious Society which the civil power has established, and still supports as 'the Church of Scotland,' in all that assembly, gathered from the remotest parts of the globe, found no representative; and gladly, most gladly would I have ceded my own place to be occupied by some one of those who have served as Moderators of the Presbyterian Establishment if this could properly and consistently have been done. But, alas! properly and consistently it could not be done, as all will know who are acquainted with the first principles of ecclesiastical order, as they were observed universally in the Church for the first fifteen centuries, and as they are still maintained equally by the three great sections of the existing Church (differing as these do among themselves upon other points)—viz., the Roman, the Eastern, and the Anglican. And thus, while men had come from the ends of the earth to deliberate with us upon questions of the deepest moment to the cause of Christianity throughout the world, other men—living as it were at the next door—men not less sincere, not less able, not less virtuous, not less deeply interested in the same

questions—were not admissible to partake in our common councils, to communicate in our united worship. Separations are soon made—made, it may be, with equal faults on both sides—but it is long before the consequences of them are fully seen. Among many evils which have thence arisen amongst ourselves, it is no small matter for regret that such an assembly was deprived of the advantage which the presence of the leading minds among the Presbyterian ministers in this country might have conferred. In like manner, who did not feel it a cause for dissatisfaction that when the Archbishop of Canterbury, the first subject of the British Crown, visited Scotland, he visited it as one who, in his spiritual capacity, did not and could not recognise the Established Church of the country; and that when he laid the foundation of a new Cathedral at Inverness, he laid it for the benefit, not of the Established Church of the country, but of the Church which the country has rejected, and still disowns? And, as time proceeds, other similar and worse consequences will be seen and felt more and more—felt at home, and felt even to the uttermost parts of the earth. Yes, in proportion as the Gospel spreads throughout the world, in proportion as the Church of England and her affiliated Churches gird themselves up (as they are now doing) more and more energetically for the work before them, it will come to be regretted more and more that the Church Establishment of this country, *as it now is* (but will not, we must hope and pray, continue much longer to be), has placed itself without the pale of possible co-operation with its southern sister, and being without the pale of co-

operation, must needs embarrass and impede her action. But this is a topic which, I am aware, there are many not yet prepared to hear of; though, to those who can look far enough and deep enough to comprehend it fully, it will appear, I believe, the most important of all topics which concern the welfare—the social, political, and religious welfare—of the nation and kingdom to which it is our boast and happiness to belong.

. . . . . .

Remarks upon the Moderator's Address in the last General Assembly.

"I have said that most gladly would I have ceded my own place in the Conference at Lambeth if it could have been occupied by some one of those who have filled the office of Moderator in the Presbyterian Establishment. And this I repeat, notwithstanding the attitude assumed towards us in the address which was delivered in the General Assembly by the respected Moderator for the present year, and to which (if we may trust a statement in the public journals) a more than usual publicity and circulation have since been given throughout the land—a circumstance which renders some notice of it on our part more necessary. That address, then, able as it was, and effectively composed for the object which the writer had in view, showed but too plainly that he had not sufficiently grasped the full bearings of the case with which he undertook to deal. He was anxious to combine the now discordant elements of Presbyterianism—and I heartily wish him God-speed

in a design which deserves, and, I fear, will require the utmost encouragement it can possibly receive—but he appeared at the same time *indifferent* or *worse than indifferent*, as to what may become of ourselves. Notwithstanding our former position as the Established Church of Scotland; notwithstanding our traditional and increasing hold upon the great families of the country—upon the representatives of its property and the representatives of its intelligence; notwithstanding our union with the Church of England—'that renowned Church,' as he himself described it, 'of which it became him to speak with unfeigned respect for its great services to the cause of Christ'[1]—notwithstanding our union, I say, with the Church of England, and with the other branches of the Anglican Church throughout the world; notwithstanding, moreover, the frequently recurring evidence that the middle and lower classes of this country are not averse to avail themselves of the advantages of our Church whenever those advantages are fairly brought within their reach; notwithstanding all this, the Moderator of the General Assembly, in his official address, saw no occasion to make to us any concession, to show us any consideration.[2]

. . . . . .

[1] Compare Dr Bisset's eulogy of the English Liturgy; see above, No. 6, p. 320.

[2] Later on in that year, Dr Crawford, in a letter to *The Scotsman* (Dec. 20), assured me that there was not "the smallest likelihood" that the terms of the Presbyterian ordination promise would be relaxed upon "the point at issue between Presbytery and Prelacy." Who can wonder if such a declaration had a tendency to cause Episcopalians to become Voluntaries?

"We are virtually told in that address, that to decline upon principle to accept Presbyterianism is to be guilty of arrogance or narrow-mindedness. No imputation can be more unfounded or more unjust. The truth is, as regards ourselves, while we love and esteem individual Presbyterians, and while we fully recognise and would seek to imitate their good works, we also, for the most part, earnestly desire to think well—as well as we dare—of Presbyterianism itself. I say advisedly, *as well as we dare*, because the better we allow ourselves to think of Presbyterianism, the worse we must necessarily be compelled to think of the whole Church—*i.e.*, of all our Christian ancestors —for the first fifteen centuries, and of the Roman, Eastern, and Anglican Churches at the present day.[1] We must be compelled to think that the primitive Churches and all others *for so long a time either did not understand the Scriptures and the teaching of the Apostles, or that they knowingly withstood and departed from them.* We must be compelled to think that at the present day the Roman, the Eastern, and the Anglican Churches all conspire to defeat the truth of God ; and I put it to the Moderator himself to decide whether, if we entertained such thoughts, we should not incur the imputation of arrogance and narrow-mindedness far more justly than we can or ought to incur it under present circumstances.

. . . . . .

"But while we have reason to complain, upon these and such like accounts, of the Moderator's

[1] See above, No. 4 of this series, p. 157.

address as it concerned ourselves, let us be thankful for the good which that address contained. It manifested a strong, though partial and contracted, sense of the evils of separation both at home and abroad. Though so far from being truly national, that it was scarcely able to look across the Tweed—still less across the Channel—yet it could extend its regard to the uttermost parts of the earth in reckoning up the evil to be escaped, and the good achieved, by the limited amount of united action and brotherly co-operation which it ventured to recommend. 'Why,' it asks—and asks most justly—'why should our Scottish Presbyterian Churches have each of them its own separate mission to the benighted heathens, and to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, so as at once to weaken their energies, to dissipate their resources, and, above all, to present a divided front to those whom they are seeking to convert, instead of joining together in one strong and combined effort to diffuse alike among Jews and Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ? Why,' it continues, 'should we not in like manner make common cause in furnishing the means of grace to our countrymen in the British Colonies, who are wisely beginning to see that there is no reason for carrying with them to the lands of their adoption those unhappy divisions which arose from circumstances altogether peculiar to the mother country?' Yes; we may well trust they are wisely beginning to see this, and more than this. They are (as I could show from correspondence which I have myself received) beginning to put these same questions

with a wider scope, with a more catholic and more patriotic aim."[1]

In the Introduction to the concluding Number, I shall have occasion to revert again to the unconciliatory and exclusive position taken up and avowed by Dr Crawford—and subsequently by others more or less prominent in the General Assembly of later years—in relation to ourselves. In the meantime, there is one remark which I would wish to make in this place.

I have endeavoured to exclude political considerations as far as possible from these "Appeals." But if it be true, as Dr Wallace (in every respect a fair and competent witness) testified[2] in 1870, when he was Minister of Old Grey Friars, that in this country "Presbyterian Parity has *intensified the democratic spirit of the Nation;*"[3] and if the policy, which refuses to relax in any way that system of Parity, is to be *resolutely and indefinitely persisted in*, then, in addition to all former arguments, we shall have a further reason to consider whether we can properly continue to give our aid to the maintenance of the said system. It is certain that the members of our Church are for the most part Conservatives, or moderate Liberals; they are not Democrats; they

[1] See above, No. 7 of this series, p. 341; and compare the Rev. James Cooper's sermon, preached at Aberdeen, Feb. 21, of this year.

[2] See also the similar testimony of the late Sir James Graham, quoted below, in No. 11, page 603, note.

[3] Essay on "Church Tendencies in Scotland," in "Recess Studies," edited by the late Sir Alexander Grant, 1870, p. 197.

are not Republicans. It is also freely admitted, even by Presbyterians themselves,[1] that if the support given to Presbyterianism by its Establishment were to be withdrawn, our Church would receive a considerable accession of numbers; and it may reasonably be inferred, that, as the increase of Prelacy, in a legitimate form, would lead to the decrease of Parity, so the democratic spirit would likewise receive a check which would gradually tend to the strengthening of our mixed Monarchical Constitution not only in Scotland, but throughout the United Kingdom. This is a consideration which appeals to the patriotism and intelligence of Presbyterians, who are not Democrats, no less than to the intelligence and patriotism of Episcopalians.

CHARLES WORDSWORTH,

Bishop of St Andrews.

June 30, 1886.

[1] For instance, by Dr MacGregor, in his St Giles' Lecture, first series. In the event of Disestablishment, "to some extent, perhaps to a large extent, Episcopacy will gain," p. 40.

ORIGINAL PREFACE.

THE following Discourse had the remarkable fortune to be preached in the audience of seven Bishops—English, Colonial, and American—and of about 300 other Clergy, besides a large assemblage of people of all classes, from the highest to the lowest, brought together on an occasion of unusual interest—the re-opening of the Cathedral at Chichester, when the Spire, which had fallen down, had been rebuilt, on November 14, 1867. It was felt by the author that an Address to be delivered by a Scottish Bishop, under such circumstances, could not be directed to a better end than to the removal of ignorance in the South concerning the Ecclesiastical position of Scotland, past and present; and to the advocacy of closer Ecclesiastical relations than those which at present exist between a large proportion of fellow-Christians and fellow-subjects in the two great divisions of this favoured isle, now happily united into one kingdom.

The auspicious elevation of a Scotchman, born and bred, to the See of Canterbury, in the person of the present Archbishop, would seem to afford an additional occasion for drawing still wider and more general attention to views and arguments tending to recommend, upon sound principles, a larger

sympathy—a more Christian and more patriotic co-operation—between the two countries in matters of Religion.

The Discourse might have remained unpublished but for the circumstances affecting the position of the Church of Ireland, which have arisen since it was delivered, and which cannot but give deeper and more urgent interest to the inquiry—*How may we best avert from Great Britain a similar policy to that which now aims*[1] *to disestablish Christianity in the Sister Island?*

The Author would be most unwilling to have it supposed that the view he has taken, and the sentiments he has expressed, are those of a true and loyal Englishman, and not also of a true and *leal* Scotchman ;[2] or, again, such as may be entertained by an Ecclesiastic, and not also by a Layman. He has therefore thought it desirable, in support of his remarks, to add in the notes references to authorities which, he believes, will be considered by all competent judges sufficient to obviate any such suspicion

[1] (*a*) The Act for the Disestablishment of the Irish Church was passed in the summer of that year, 1869.

[2] (*a*) Besides my long naturalization in Scotland (now for forty years), I claim to be very nearly *a Borderer* by Family descent. It may be remembered how my uncle, the Poet, as living at Rydal, wrote concerning Burns, in 1803, seven years after his death :

> " Huge Criffel's hoary rock ascends
> *By Skiddaw seen ;—*
> *Neighbours we were,* and loving friends
> We might have been."

And my grandfather, who resided at Cockermouth, in Cumberland, was still more of a " neighbour."

in both respects. He alludes particularly to the Church History of Mr Grub (which has been commended by eminent Presbyterians, for its accuracy and fairness), and to the popular novels of Sir Walter Scott.

The Feu House, Perth,
14th January 1869.

POSTSCRIPT.

Some of my Readers may be pleased to see the kindly terms in which the following Sermon is referred to by the late Dean Stanley in his "Lecture on the History of the Church of Scotland," delivered in Edinburgh, 1872. Second Edition, 1879. p. 176.

Bishopshall, St Andrews,
1st July 1886.

PRAYER FOR UNITY.

O GOD, the Father of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, our only Saviour, the Prince of Peace; give grace to us and all thy people in this land, seriously to lay to heart the great dangers we are in by our unhappy divisions. Take away all hatred and prejudice, and whatsoever else may hinder us from godly Union and Concord: that, as there is but one Body, and one Spirit, and one Hope of our Calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one GOD and Father of us all, so we may henceforth be all of one heart, and of one soul, united in one holy bond of Truth and Peace, of Faith and Charity, and may with one mind and one mouth glorify Thee: through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Obs. –The notes added in this reprint are distinguished by letters within parentheses, *e.g.* (*a*)

EUODIAS AND SYNTYCHE;

&c., &c., &c.

"I beseech Euodias and beseech Syntyche[1] that they be of the same mind in the Lord."—PHILIPPIANS iv. 2.

IN this, the most tender and affectionate of St Paul's Epistles, we discover more of the spirit which is needful for Christians in their relations towards each other at the present day, than is to be found, perhaps, in any other portion of the inspired volume. It is not merely that the great foundations of the Gospel are laid down so plainly that nothing could be more express,—the Godhead and Manhood of Jesus Christ; His humiliation unto death, and consequent exaltation into a lordship, not only over His Church, but over all created things;[2] the righteousness which is through faith in Christ;[3] and the practice of holiness, without which that faith can be of no avail;[4] the necessity and all-sufficiency of co-operating grace to supply the insufficiency of human weakness;[5] the duty and the efficacy of prayer;[6]—it is not merely the plain statement of these fundamental truths which claims our regard; but we see, moreover, in this Epistle, intimation given of, and allowance made

[1] (*a*) In the Revised Version, "I exhort Euodia, and I exhort Syntyche. . . ."

[2] ii. 6-11. [3] iii. 9. [4] iii. 18-20. [5] ii. 13; iv. 13. [6] iv. 6-7.

for, a state of things which corresponds only too nearly with that which we witness amongst ourselves. Even then, it would seem, there were some who preached Christ, not of love, but of contention;[1] and among the Philippians themselves there is evidence of disagreement, which could not fail to cause distress and embarrassment, more especially in a church which was still in the course of its first formation. But when I say that allowance is made by the Apostle for this state of things, I do not mean such allowance as is too commonly claimed for it in our own time: allowance not only to preach Christ though it be of envy and strife, but in our preaching to gainsay each other; not only to gainsay but to separate; not only to separate, but to glory in separation,—to plead its necessity, its expediency; to argue that so long as human nature remains what we see it is—with so much variety of thought, so much diversity and contrariety of opinion—the maintenance of unanimity and concord among Christians is neither desirable nor possible. No; not allowance such as this do we find either here or elsewhere in the New Testament; but, on the contrary, we find the most explicit and earnest disallowal of any such assumptions. So far from acquiescing in the necessity or expediency of divisions, nothing can be plainer, nothing more urgent, than the language in which the inspired writer of this Epistle dissuades and deprecates such a course. So far from acknowledging the impossibility of Christians being brought to agree upon all *essential points*, and to live together in *visible unity*, he will

[1] i. 16.

be content to admit of nothing less; it is the one topic which he presses most eagerly, to which he recurs most frequently. Thus, in the first chapter: "Only let your conversation [that is, your manner of life] be as it becometh the Gospel of Christ; that whether I come and see you, or else be absent, I may hear of your affairs that ye stand fast *in one spirit, with one mind striving together* for the faith of the Gospel."[1] And shortly after, at the beginning of the second chapter, still more pathetically: "If there be, therefore, any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any fellowship of the Spirit, if any bowels and mercies, fulfil ye my joy, that ye be *like minded*, having the *same love*, being of *one accord*, of *one mind*."[2] And further on, having plainly in his thoughts some particulars to which the Epistle affords no sufficient clue: "Let us, therefore as many as be perfect, be thus minded; and if in anything ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you. Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us *walk by the same rule*, let us *mind the same thing*."[3] And once more, ere he concludes, he does not scruple to name and adjure the individuals whose disagreement he had probably heard of with most concern: "I beseech Euodias, and beseech Syntyche, that they be of *one mind* in the Lord."[4]

Happy would it have been, my brethren, both for England and for Scotland, if they had taken to themselves for their joint guidance this Scriptural entreaty of the great Apostle. Happy would it have been if they had learned to look in a loving, Christian, sympathising spirit each upon the things of the other,

[1] i. 27. [2] ii. 1-2. [3] iii. 16. [4] iv. 2.

and not only upon its own! And there was a time, in the infancy of their religious life, when the effect of such a spirit was largely felt to the good of both. There was a time (in the 7th century) when Bishops and holy men, issuing from a Scottish Isle, carried with them their treasure of Divine things; and renewing the foundations of the faith which heathen conquerors had destroyed, exercised a blessed, sanctifying influence in a greater or less degree, over all the English provinces northward of the Thames.[1] But it was not so at a later period, when, instead of cherishing gratitude for those early services, attempts were made—again and again—on the part of the stronger country to bring the weaker into subjection, not only in their civil, but also in their ecclesiastical relations; and that, too, at a time when it was equally their duty and their interest to encourage and assist one another against the encroachments, which both had already begun to suffer from the Church of Rome. The attempts failed, as they deserved to fail; but they left remembrances, which, after the lapse of five centuries, still remain, and serve, unhappily, to keep alive a feeling of suspicion and jealousy[2] in the breasts of many of our northern fellow-countrymen, who glory, not without reason, in the thought of the independence achieved for their forefathers by the victories of Wallace and of Bruce.

It might have been hoped that, when the crisis of the Reformation arrived, all such feeling would have given place to a desire to strengthen each other's

[1] See Russell's Hist., i. 15. Grub, i. 86, iii. 61.

[2] See Sir Walter Scott's "Fortunes of Nigel," ii. p. 162; "Rob Roy," i. p. 54; "Black Dwarf," p. 85.

hands in the common struggle for their deliverance from a foreign yoke, and for the recovery of their spiritual birthright. And to a small extent, for a short time, this proved to be the case. On the one hand, the most eminent of the Scotch opponents of Popery, John Knox (after his escape from the French galleys), was employed by the English Privy Council as one of the preachers of the Reformed doctrine, during the short reign of the young King Edward VI. On the other hand, it was the opportune assistance of Queen Elizabeth which mainly won for the Scotch Reformers their first ascendancy, and which led to the sudden triumph of their cause in the year 1560. The value assigned at the time to that assistance may be inferred from the fact, that, a service of public thanksgiving having been appointed to be held in Edinburgh on a set day, July 10, the form of prayer used on the occasion contained the following words: —"Seeing that nothing is more odious in Thy presence, O Lord, than is ingratitude; and seeing that Thou hast made our confederates of England the instruments by whom we are now set at this liberty, to whom we in Thy name have promised mutual faith again; let us never fall into that unkindness, O Lord, that either we declare ourselves unthankful to them, or profaners of Thy Holy Name. . . . Retain Thou us so firmly together by the power of Thy Holy Spirit, that Satan have never power to set us again at variance nor discord! Give us Thy grace to live in that Christian charity which Thy Son our Lord Jesus has so earnestly commanded to all the members of His body; that other nations, provoked by our example . . . may study to live

in tranquillity and peace as it becomes the sheep of Thy pasture!"[1]

Unhappily, however, the conduct of Mary, the Scottish Queen—her firm determination to abide by the cause of Rome—the relations in which she consequently stood, on the one hand, towards the reforming body of her own subjects, and on the other hand, towards her jealous relative, the Queen of England,—all these produced a complication and confusion of interests, which rendered for the present any such firm and cordial attachment between the two countries hopeless and impracticable. And what, meanwhile, was the condition of Religion? In England, under the strong government of Queen Elizabeth, the Reformed cause had been consolidated, not upon new, but upon the old foundations.[2] In Scotland, on the contrary, so complete and so violent had been the collapse of the ancient system, that the very foundations had given way; and at the same time, both before the abdication of Mary, and during the frequent change of Regencies which ensued, there was no sufficient settlement in the State to secure the reconstruction of the fallen edifice upon any definite or well-considered principle.

It has been often remarked that the Reformation in Scotland took place a century too soon,—not, indeed, too soon, if we look only to the abuses and corruptions which there had reached a greater height

[1] Knox, Hist., ii. 84-87. Tytler, vi. 203, *seq.* See above, No. 5 of this series, p. 218.

[2] It must not be supposed that the Author is prepared to defend the measures—impolitic as they were severe—which the government of Queen Elizabeth adopted, in order to enforce uniformity of Religion.

than in any other country of Christendom,—but too soon in relation to the backward state of social order and political rule; and, consequently, to the prospect of a wise and peaceable re-arrangement of so great a matter as the Established religion of a whole nation. Not to dwell upon the barbarism, which, among so many splendid monuments of ecclesiastical architecture, suffered scarcely one to escape the universal ruin; it does not appear that any distinct conception was originally entertained by the Scotch Reformers themselves, in regard to the nature and authority of the Ministry which was to succeed the extirpation of the rejected Hierarchy. It is true they professed, in contending with the enemies of Reformation, that they would be willing to abide by the results of an impartial appeal (such as the English Reformers had made), not only to Scripture, but to the principles and practice of the early Christians.[1] This they professed; but they wanted the learning or the sagacity, to see and to draw the line —which the English Reformers saw and drew so clearly from the first—between the usurped ultra-Prelatical authority of the Bishop of Rome, and the legitimate authority of a national Episcopate; or, in other words, of an independent ministry, consisting of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.[2] At the same time, there was no sufficient authority or influence of any kind to curb the rapacity of the nobles, and even of the Administrators of the Crown during the long

[1] Knox, i. 305; iv. 518. (Mr Grub, however, ii. 46, doubts the sincerity of Knox in this matter.) See also Willoch in Keith, iii. 309.

[2] See Preface to Ordination Services, and compare Grub, ii. 322.

minority of James.[1] Many of the nobles had joined the Reformers' ranks from hope of spoil, and soon contrived to enrich themselves out of the vast possessions, not only of the suppressed monasteries, but of the deprived Bishops. They were content, indeed, in some instances, to allow certain of the Ministers to hold the name and title of the Episcopal office, but only in order that so, through their means, they might secure to themselves the main portion of the prey more readily; a conspiracy in sacrilege which at once disgraced the Reforming cause, and degraded still further the sacred office, the corruption and arrogance of which, during a long series of years, had mainly provoked and precipitated the crisis which had now arrived. Meanwhile, the more earnest of the Reformers—none of whom were of the order of Bishops—were fain to bear, though not without frequent and sore complaints, the infamous spoliation which they could not prevent, in consideration of the spiritual victory which, as they imagined, they were gaining to the cause of God.

It was under circumstances such as these that the regular succession of the ministry in the Church of Scotland, which had continued from the first introduction of Christianity, came to an end. It had allied itself with Popery, to the utter forfeiture of its

[1] James was crowned in his second year, upon the abdication of his mother, Queen Mary, who had been crowned in her first year—probably the two longest successive minorities to be found in history; and both may serve to verify the Scriptural saying, "Woe to thee, O land, when thy king is a child!"—Eccles. x. 16. In proof of the statement of the text, see the Act of Parliament, 1587, referred to in Grub, ii. 287.

national independence, and with Popery it fell.[1] Under the shelter of that alliance, while the Hierarchy, in every religious respect had become degenerate, the Clergy as a body claimed exemption from the laws which governed their fellow-subjects. In the general detestation of these abuses, no one cared to enquire how far the original rights, which they had themselves so weakly and fatally surrendered to a foreign power, were just and legitimate, and ought to have been retained for the honour of religion and for the common good: only men saw that the downfall had been deserved, and they turned themselves to consider how the position which had been forfeited might be best supplied.

In this consideration, the intercourse which had arisen between Scotland and Geneva, in the person, first, of John Knox, and, afterwards, of Andrew Melville,[2] determined, though not till after frequent swayings to and fro, during upwards of thirty years (1560-92), determined, I say, the course which for a short period (1592-1606) was eventually pursued. A platform such as Calvin had established, under

[1] The most striking distinction between the English and Scottish Reformation is to be found in the different attitude assumed by the English and Scotch Bishops towards the Council of Trent. The decrees of that Council were disallowed by the former, but accepted by the latter; and it is this fact which forms the chief justification of Knox and the Scottish Reformers. The last Provincial Council of Scotland, in 1559, left them no alternative between *subscription to the Decrees of Trent*—so far as they were then completed—and *martyrdom at the stake*. If they *rebelled* against *such Bishops*, who shall condemn them?

[2] John Knox had been episcopally ordained before the Reformation; but Andrew Melville, like John Calvin, was without clerical Ordination of any kind.

somewhat similar circumstances, would be acceptable to the nobles, who looked with jealousy on the old pre-eminence of the ecclesiastics, and who had largely shared in the Church's spoils; and acceptable also to the great middle class, whom the recent convulsion had first taught to feel their importance, and whom such a system, by the prominence which it gave to the action of the laity as ruling elders, would seem most readily to secure in the position of influence and independence to which they had been raised; and all the more because the greater part of the Reforming Ministers themselves belonged to that class.[1] But on the other hand, another view would be opened, when, in 1603, the crown of Scotland had become united with that of England, in the person of King James. That king's own experience, indeed, had previously led him to regard "parity in the Church," to use his own words, as "the mother of confusion and the enemy to unity, which is the mother of order;"[2] and he had sought, not always by straightforward means, to circumvent and defeat the designs of its adherents. And now he naturally desired, in accordance with the advice of his English Lord Chancellor, Bacon,[3] to put an end to the disagreement which had arisen between the two portions of his dominions in the matter of religion, and, as both professed equal zeal in the cause of Reformation, to combine their energies, so far as might be, at once in opposition to Roman error, and in support of Scriptural truth. He had publicly expressed this desire before he left Edin-

[1] Grub, ii. 109.

[2] Basil. Doron., p. 160.

[3] Bacon's Works, i. 452, 351, Edition 1838.

burgh, "that as God had joined the right of both kingdoms in his person, so they might be joined in wealth, in religion, in hearts, and affections."[1] But the very circumstance which rendered the feeling of such a desire on King James' part more natural, served to render the accomplishment of it more arduous. Had the Stuart dynasty continued to sit only upon the throne of its native land, a nearer view of the persons and circumstances with which the sovereign had to deal might have led to the exercise of greater caution and forbearance; whereas the removal of his personal presence, and of the influence attending it, could not fail to aggravate difficulties[2] in themselves sufficiently great, and to make less hopeful the issue of a design on every account most desirable. But a graver obstacle still remains to be pointed out. The want of qualities needful to carry on the government of the kingdom upon the scale to which it was now enlarged, on the part of the Stuart occupants of the English throne, is a fact which must not be disguised, involving, as it did, in course of time, both their old and their new dominions, first, in the calamities of a civil war, and afterwards in the necessity of a Revolution; which, though in the main peaceably brought about, not only produced great temporary embarrassment, but left behind it elements of weakness which are felt even to the present day.

[1] Grub, ii. 279.

[2] See Scott's "Bride of Lammermoor," vol. i., p. 282, *seq.*, on the evils which resulted from the "delegated authority" of the Stuarts in Scotland after the departure of James VI. to England.

But to return to the attempt made by James after the union of the Scottish with the English crown.

He could little have understood the temper of his northern subjects if he expected that the wish which was natural to himself would be natural also to them. We know that even a century later (viz., in 1707) the feeling of inveterate suspicion on the part of the Scotch towards England, or, must I rather say? the feeling of jealousy on both sides,[1] was still so strong, that it was not without great difficulty that the union of the two countries, then happily accomplished, was carried into effect. It was therefore no recommendation, but altogether the reverse, that in order to restore the broken and extinct[2] succession of a genuine Episcopate in the Scottish Church, it became necessary to have recourse to the Church of England. In this proceeding, which took place in 1610 (when four English Bishops consecrated the three Scotchmen who came up to London for the purpose[3]), everything was done which the nicest delicacy could suggest to consult the feelings and guard the independence of the northern hierarchy. The objection that none of the three had previously received Episcopal ordination was overruled. Neither of the two English

[1] See Grub, ii. 280. Scott's "Black Dwarf," p. 150.

[2] The last survivor of the Ante-Reformation Prelates, James Beaton, Archbishop of Glasgow (consecrated in 1552), died at Paris, in 1603, the year of James' accession to the English throne.

[3] At London House, 21st October, Abbot, Bishop of London; Andrewes, Bishop of Ely; Neale, Bishop of Rochester; Parry, Bishop of Worcester; consecrated Spottiswood to be Archbishop of Glasgow; Lamb to be Bishop of Brechin; Hamilton to be Bishop of Galloway: Bancroft being then Archbishop of Canterbury, and Gladstones being consecrated by the three last named on their return to be Archbishop of St Andrews. He died in 1615.

metropolitans took part in the consecration, and the Scottish metropolitan, the Archbishop of St Andrews, was not one of those who received the gift, and through whom it was communicated on their return to their Scottish brethren appointed to fill the eleven other ancient sees. Still the proceeding was one which had not so much as the semblance of a transaction in which the Scottish people themselves had been invited to take any part. It was therefore but too natural that Bishops so created should be received with prejudice from the very first, as creatures only of the crown,[1] and of the crown when the larger part of it was no longer Scotch, but English. And thus the hierarchy, which before had suffered itself to become identified with the usurpations of Popery, now became identified in the popular mind with whatever was unconstitutional, whatever was arbitrary or excessive in the exercise of the sovereign's prerogative and of the supremacy which he claimed both in Church and State.[2]

There was unhappily too much reason for complaints upon these accounts,[3] more especially when, in 1625, the Stuart sceptre had passed from the hands of James into those of his son and successor, Charles I. I need not do more than allude to the failure which attended the attempt made in 1637 to introduce into Scotland a Liturgy modelled after that of England,—failure which was caused not so

[1] Grub, ii. 359.

[2] *Ibid.*, ii. 313, 315, *seq.*, 333, *seq.* The Bishops themselves "were far from severe in enforcing the penalties of non-conformity. . . . Some of them were models of humility and devotion," p. 401.

[3] *Ibid.*, ii. 286, 289, 302, 308, 310, 313, 324, 332, *seq.*, 339 363, *seq.*

much by dislike of the Liturgy itself (the contents of which were generally unknown) as by the circumstance that it was known to be mainly English in its origin,[1] and still more by the unconstitutional means which the king employed to force it upon the people, who, at the same time, were insufficiently informed and unprepared for its reception.[2] Conduct such as this, joined with the recent establishment of the Court of High Commission ;[3] with the appointment, in one instance at least, of a great Ecclesiastic to high political office,[4] an abuse which had been discontinued since the Reformation ; and with certain indications of a design on the part of the Crown to revoke the grants of the Church lands ;[5]—conduct, I say, such as this was enough to alienate, and rouse to opposition, a multitude of all classes, but especially of the nobility, who were now the most disaffected portion of the king's subjects.[6] No one, however, could have anticipated results so sudden or so deplorable as those which actually occurred.

In the following year (1638), the framing at Edinburgh of the so-called National Covenant, and the violent measures of the General Assembly held at Glasgow, produced an Ecclesiastical crisis no less

[1] Grub, ii. 394, *seq.*, and comp. iii. 3 and 320.

[2] *Ibid.*, ii. 367. 374. 390. 393, 396, *seq.*, iii. 50. The influence and dictation of Archbishop Laud, though really less than was supposed, were very injurious. See Laud's Correspondence, Works, vol. vi. p. 455, *seq.*, 495, *seq.*, and comp. Professor Masson's lecture on the Presbyterian Movement, 1638-42, as reported in *Scotsman*, Jan. 25, 1868.

[3] *Ibid.*, ii. 291, 365, 407.

[4] *Ibid.*, ii. 353, 401 ; see also iii. 6, 21, 29, 48, 61.

[5] *Ibid.*, ii. 295, 336, 380, 393, 399, 402.

[6] *Ibid.*, ii. 402 ; iii. 55, 62, 83, *seq.*

extraordinary, and still more complete, than that which had taken place in 1560; and the sounder system of polity, of doctrine, and of ritual, which, during the previous thirty years, so much care and pains had been spent in endeavouring to construct, was dashed to pieces as it were with a single blow, to be succeeded by a period of turbulence and disorder, in which political discontent, and a spirit of extreme Calvinism (which had gradually leavened a large mass of the population[1]) *combined* to supply the fermenting power. Standards of insurrection bore the motto, "for Christ's Crown and Covenant." Nor was the contagion of that anarchy and fanaticism confined to Scotland. The twelve years that followed (1638—1650) witnessed, indeed, a professed conjunction, a forced conformity[2] between the two countries, in matters of Religion, under the terms of "a solemn League and Covenant," such as had been unknown before, and has been unexampled since. But it was a conjunction and conformity entailing consequences over which no good Christian could rejoice; and which ended in the subjection of the Scottish kingdom to the armed occupation of an English usurper, and in the attempted, and partially executed, substitution of an Ecclesiastical system neither Presbyterian nor Prelatical, over both countries, in accordance with the Dictator's will.[3]

Turning our eyes from the civil bloodshed, from

[1] Grub, p. 306.

[2] See Baillie's Letters and Journals, vol. ii., *passim*, for assertions of intolerance, and for the importance attached, in the Ecclesiastical Councils of the Westminster Assembly, to the successes of the Army.

[3] See Scott's "Legend of Montrose," p. 10; "Woodstock," ii. p. 301.

the assassination of the king, and the overthrow of the Constitution in Church and State; our present concern is to notice, on the one hand, the portentous upgrowth then manifested of Heresies and Schisms,[1] together with a worse than Papal intolerance and spirit of persecution towards all who dissented from the predominant sect;[2] and on the other hand, to recall to mind the strange combination which wrought the work of the so-named Westminster Assembly (1643-47), and the still stranger destiny which has since attended the labours of that questionable body;[3] —a body which the royal proclamation had from the first forbidden to meet,[4] and which owed all its authority to a parliament claiming a supremacy in matters ecclesiastical more unconstitutional than the supremacy against which it had rebelled. It is, indeed, an unhappy augury for the doctrinal standards of any religious community, for its worship and for its discipline, that they should be the offspring, not only of a state of society, thoroughly disorganised,

[1] See Edward's "Gangræna," *passim*, especially the Epistle Dedicatory; Scott's "Woodstock," i. p. 178, *seq.* 322; Baillie's Letters, ii., *passim*.

[2] Grub, iii. 165; Russell, Appendix to Keith, pp. 487-9, 491.

[3] Clarendon's description is as follows:—"A few very reverend and worthy men were inserted; yet of the whole number there were not above twenty who were not declared and avowed enemies to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England; some of them infamous in their lives and conversations, and most of them of very mean parts in learning, if not of scandalous ignorance; and of no other reputation than of malice to the Church of England."—Vol. ii. p. 423, *seq.* "The whole number," including 30 Lords and Commoners, was 151. The Scotch members were only six—four ministers and two laymen.

[4] Grub, iii. 97. Hetherington, p. 3.

[5] See Grub, iii. 151; Russell, Appendix to Keith, p. 492.

but of a fanatical agitation—of a covenanted rebellion! A strange anomaly indeed it is, that the same standards, the same rule of worship and church government, which were rejected by the country that gave them birth almost as soon as they were produced, should yet, after similar rejection, be again (as they were at the Revolution of 1689) taken up and cherished in a sister land, justly boastful of its independence, and singularly jealous both of secular intrusion into sacred things, and of real or apparent dictation[1] from any external source!—Strange, mysteriously strange it is, that the name of "Westminster" should, even at the present day, be chiefly heard in Scotland as the valued badge of an illegitimate authority, which, at Westminster itself, has long since passed away; and that greater deference should be paid to it than to the authority of the Word of God; which, in this Epistle of St Paul, commands us, as fellow Christians, to "walk by the same rule—to mind the same thing!"

But to proceed with the stream of historical events which I have undertaken to trace.

On the overthrow of the Commonwealth by the restoration of Charles II. there were Bishops in England who had survived the troubles sufficient in number, and more than sufficient,[2] to reconstitute the succession; but it was not so in Scotland. Consequently, in order to re-establish there the Episcopal

[1] This applies to the Westminster Directory, the two Catechisms, and the Confession of Faith; but not so much to the Form of Church Government, which was framed mainly in accordance with the Scotch "Second Book of Discipline," of 1581.

[2] In England nine, in Scotland only one,—Thomas Sydserf, Bishop of Galloway, translated to Orkney after the Restoration.

or Threefold Ministry, it became necessary to have recourse a second time to the same procedure which had been adopted in the reign of James. Four Scotchmen came up to London, and, in December 1661, were consecrated to the Episcopate, in Westminster Abbey, by four of the English Bishops. As on the former occasion, neither of the English Archbishops took part in the consecration; but among the four who received the gift were the Prelates designate of both the Scotch Archbishoprics.[1] There was, however, one qualification obviously most desirable, if not absolutely indispensable, which England could not supply, and which, unhappily, as it had been wanting in part before, so it was still more deficient now: I mean some signification of consent—some semblance, at least, of election and approval on the part of those to whom the new Bishops were to minister; something beyond the single act of prerogative on the part of the Crown which caused them to be named, to be consecrated, to be sent to their respective sees. The defect, I say again, was most unfortunate,—both on other accounts, and because it tended to confirm in the minds of the Scottish people the unhappy impression that Episcopacy was set up again, not because it was primitive and catholic, not because it was of scriptural or divine authority, nor because it had to show any sufficient proof

[1] Sheldon, Bishop of London; Morley, Bishop of Worcester; Sterne, Bishop of Carlisle; Lloyd, Bishop of Llandaff; consecrated Sharp to be Archbishop of St Andrews; Fairfoul to be Archbishop of Glasgow; Leighton to be Bishop of Dunblane; Hamilton to be Bishop of Galloway. Sharp and Leighton were previously ordained in private as Deacons and Priests; the others had received Episcopal ordination from the former succession.

of the national preference to which it might appeal; but simply because it had been restored in England, and because it was agreeable to the Sovereign's will.[1] And thus once more, justly or unjustly, it became identified in the popular opinion with arbitrary dictation pronounced on its behalf, in violation of good faith; and with the proceedings of the civil and military power exerted for its support—and exerted too frequently without dignity, without consistency, in a spirit at one time of undue indulgence, but far more often of extreme severity.[2] This continued during a second period of thirty years; and there is reason to think that this renewed attempt to place the Reformation in Scotland upon a sound and catholic basis, notwithstanding the serious drawbacks which have been named, and other difficulties and disadvantages with which it had to contend, might eventually have proved successful, had not the Scotch Bishops themselves, when the Revolution came (in 1689), unanimously refused to concur in the course which was adopted in England for the settlement of the Crown. It is not for me to canvass the Christian wisdom of this refusal, nor to determine how far the same sensitively-national and anti-English feeling, which we have had occasion to notice all along, together with a keener sense of loyalty towards the

[1] Grub, iii. 186.

[2] Russell, App. to Keith, p. 494; who shows, however, how much there was to complain of on the side of the rebellious fanatics as well as of the Government. Mr Hill Burton is justly strong in his condemnation of the proceedings of the "Statesmen of the Restoration, if the name of Statesmen can be applied to them." "Criminal Trials," ii., 201, 206, 211, *seq*. See also Scott's "Old Mortality," ii., 169, 192, 198, 247, 314.

Stuart family as of Scotch descent, may have mixed unconsciously with the righteous scruple which prevented them, as they alleged, from transferring their allegiance to the new Sovereign. The scruple itself, which was shared, we know, by several of the best of the English Prelates—including the Primate, Archbishop Sancroft[1]—is doubtless entitled to all respect; but neither can it be denied that the consequences of it, as they have affected not only Scotland, but England also, and, it may be truly said, the British dominions throughout the world, have been, and are, most deplorable. It is certain that the Scottish Bishops, as a body,[2] had no more sympathy than their English brethren with the errors and bigotry of James II., or with the unhappy perversion which led him to the Church of Rome; but they naturally became, after the Revolution, identified with his political schemes;[3] and, in too many instances, the ministers and members of the Church of which they were the representatives, allowed themselves to join in the wild and unsuccessful attempts which, for more than half a century, were made to overthrow the

[1] And, I may add, "the excellent Ken," as he is called even by Lord Macaulay. Hist., ii. 430; iii. 84.

[2] Some of them suffered for their opposition to Romanism; *e.g.*, Cairncross, Archbishop of Glasgow (deprived); Bruce, Bishop of Dunkeld (deprived); and Aitken of Galloway. See Clarke's "Letters of Scottish Prelates," p. xxxii., xxxv., *seq.*, 25, 94, *seq.* One of them, however, Bishop Gordon of Galloway, who accompanied King James II. to France, afterwards joined the Church of Rome, and received the minor orders in that Communion. Grub, iii. 313.

[3] (*a*) Grub's Hist., iii. 314, *seq.*; Introduction to Scott's "Redgauntlet;" Rev. W. Walker's Lives of Bp. Gleig, and of Bp. Jolly.

Revolution settlement. By so doing — especially after the political union of the two countries, in accordance with that settlement, had been voluntarily accepted upon both sides—they tarnished the glory of a confessorship borne nobly and consistently, and attended, in the case of the Clergy, with the loss of all earthly goods. They brought upon themselves and upon their cause the just suspicion of the existing government. They gave occasion for the enactment of penal statutes, severe and excessive, and conceived in the worst spirit of intolerance; statutes the action of which, before the end of the last century (when they were repealed) had reduced our Church, previously in possession of every parish in the land,[1] to a miserably weak and scattered remnant of less than fifty congregations;[2] and meanwhile, as, by their adherence to the fallen fortunes of James, the way was opened for the re-establishment of Presbyterianism, so, through the consequences of that adherence, its continuance has been secured to the present time. It was settled, indeed, primarily[3] upon no better

[1] It is the testimony of Dr Carlyle, Presbyterian Minister of Inveresk, that at the time of the Revolution, when Episcopacy was disestablished, "two-thirds of the people, and most of the gentry, were Episcopals." But, what is still stronger, it is the testimony of Mr Hill Burton, our best Scotch Historian, that "it is not quite clear one would be wrong in deciding that a *very small fraction only* of the people were heartily attached to the moderate (Presbyterian) polity established by King William. It was (he adds) an entirely artificial adjustment. . . . It contained the elements of dissolution. It did not keep entirely whole even till its politic founder was in his grave." "Hist. of Scotland," ii., 202, *seq.*

[2] Skinner's "Scottish Episcopacy," p. 559.

[3] See Grub's Hist., iii. p. 303, 308. Ultimately, and at best, it rests entirely upon Acts of the secular power. *Ibid.*, p. 307. Hill Burton's Hist., ii., p. 188-90; and above, No. 9, p. 504, *seq.*

foundation than an exercise of the royal will—the will of King William : but of this, Episcopacy cannot reasonably complain, having accepted for itself a foundation equally insufficient, equally unsound, when it was restored by Charles II.

The time will not suffer me to trace the subsequent fortunes of Presbyterianism in Scotland, nor to show how, as Established, it has become weak through repeated divisions—especially by the great Disruption (in 1843), and consequent foundation of what is now called "the Free Church;"—divisions which have arisen, for the most part, out of questions of Patronage and of the connection of Church and State. The task, indeed, were I at liberty to attempt it, would be an invidious one; and happily it is not necessary for my present aim. Only in accordance with that aim, it may be suggested that (irrespective of all question of comparative nearness to the truth), there might seem to be greater likelihood of a desire for reapproachment, on the part of those now separated bodies, to that body which is *the Reformed representative of original Unity, and is in communion with the Church of England*, than to its substitute, as now established, from which they have parted more recently, and towards which they may naturally find it more difficult to overcome the unkindly feelings, which such ruptures—more especially when the wound is fresh—are wont unhappily to leave behind.

Thus, then, it has come to pass that, in the two countries united into one kingdom within this same island, and presenting so many motives to mutual attachment, so many calls and occasions for the closest and most constant intercourse,—religion alone

occupies a position which, as regards the mass of their respective inhabitants, keeps them at a distance and alien from each other. Religion, which ought to be, and is, in its true nature, the strictest and most effectual of all bonds of union, serves to disunite them! More than this; it has come to pass that the sovereign of this one united kingdom is placed by law in the anomalous and embarrassing attitude of a sworn maintainer of two ecclesiastical establishments which do not, and cannot, as they now stand, consistently combine or co-operate for the common good.[1] And this condition of things as regards Scotland, is the more to be lamented, because it has ceased, in great measure, to be connected with conscientious scruples, or with religious principle, founded, rightly or wrongly, upon the conviction of truth. For instance, it is not the notion of Episcopacy, or of a liturgy, as such, and viewed simply with reference to their own real merits or demerits,—it is not this which now, for the most part (at least among the educated classes) creates the bias against them in the Scottish mind; but it is *the remembrance of these things as they were formerly associated with Popery before the Reformation, and since the Reformation, during the continuance of the Stuart dynasty, with arbitrary power.*[2] This appears both in other ways,

[1] "These two Churches [established in Great Britain], as now existing, are rather *antagonists* than *allies*." Dr R. Lee's "Reform of the Church of Scotland," p. 41. What an advantage does this fact give to the Church of Rome, and also to the advocates of the Voluntary principle! See above, No. 2, p. 67.

[2] See Scott's "Bride of Lammermoor," vol. i., p. 389. "When I recollect the times of the first and second Charles, and of the last James, truly I see little reason that as *a man*, or as *a patriot*, I should

and from the fact that many of the most pious and most intelligent Presbyterians (especially among the ministers) are ready to speak in the highest terms of the English Church Establishment,[1] and even to prefer it to their own,—only, they will be apt to add, they think their own best suited for themselves. They pay themselves, if I may presume to say so, too poor a compliment. They have not, indeed, attained to what is best in those respects in which the Church of England has attained to it, but they have attained to it in others in which the Church of England has fallen short. In the loss of the full constitution of the Apostolic Ministry,[2] with its thrice-repeated Ordination as it rises to its highest grade; in the want of a due security for a reverential order of the public worship of God; in the disuse of the scriptural ordinance of Confirmation; in neglect of the stated commemoration of the great events of the earthly life and death of our Redeemer: in the case of these certainly not unimportant things, must it not be said that they have broken away too rudely from the traditions of the past, and from the practice of the universal church? But, on the other hand,

draw my sword for their descendants." Words put by Sir Walter into the mouth of a cavalier, the Master of Ravenswood.

[1] A leading article in the *Edinburgh Courant*, the organ of the Presbyterian Establishment, speaks of the Church of England (September 23, 1867) as "the Church we all love and admire."

[2] It is to be observed that Irvingism, or the so-called *Apostolic Church*, with its fourfold Ministry, had its origin in Scotland, and is a consequence of reaction from the extreme negations of Presbyterianism in regard to the true threefold constitution of the Christian Ministry, and especially of the negation of a succession to the Apostleship in the order of Bishops; just as Presbyterianism itself had been a reaction from the *ultra-Prelatical* development of the supremacy claimed for the Bishop of Rome.

must it not be also said, they have nobly maintained[1] what is due to the liberty and prerogatives of the Church as a superhuman ordinance; they have vindicated for lay church members of all classes a position which, though pressed beyond the line of Scripture and of ancient usage,[2] has its foundation in principles accepted by the greatest of our own divines; they have retained unimpaired the practice and authority of Ecclesiastical Assemblies; they have secured more just relations with the civil powers. Yes, in these points which are scarcely, if at all, less important than the former, they have set an example which even the Church of England herself might do well to imitate.

Surely, then, the time is come, when the two great divisions of this favoured Isle should learn, as this Epistle of St Paul would teach them, to look not only upon their own things, but also upon the things of each other; and so to look upon them that they may be led to "walk by the same rule" in regard to the form of Christianity which they would wish to see established in both countries. In the great work of Reformation they set out, be it remembered, from the same principles; and it has been due to foreign and anti-national influences, and to the untoward action of political events now long since past, more than to any other cause, that they have failed hitherto to reach, in loving companionship, the same goal.

[1] See Grub's History, iii. 330, *seq.*

[2] See the learned and judicious treatise of the [late] Principal of the University of Aberdeen, Dr P. C. Campbell, on the "Theory of the Ruling Eldership," *passim.* 1866. "Röthe's argument against what are called 'Lay Elders' seems to me conclusive." Milman, "Hist. S. C.," vol. ii., p. 21, note.

Both have formally accepted, not only the main articles of Christian belief as summed up in the (so-called) Apostles' Creed, but also the decisions of the four first general Councils in regard to the Heresies which those Councils severally condemned;[1] and so far both are *Catholic*. Both have repudiated the usurped supremacy of the Church of Rome, both have renounced the worst errors and corruptions of that Church, and so far both are *Protestant*. Both alike assert the supremacy and all-sufficiency of Holy Scripture; and there was a time (1558), as I have pointed out before, when the first and greatest of the Scotch Reformers, no less than those of England, were prepared to appeal to primitive antiquity as the best and safest guide to the right interpretation of the written Word. Moreover, there was a time (1558-65) when the use of a Liturgy—such, nay, *the very same*, as that used in England—was in Scotland also accepted and prescribed;[2] there was a time (1572) when the more mature judgment of the same leaders of the Scottish Reformation sanctioned a Ministry and Policy of the Church closely resembling the Ministry and Policy of the Church of England as it then was, and still is, constituted.[3]

It will be understood, that in what has now been said I have been speaking, not as a Bishop of the Church in Scotland, which (though disestablished) is already in the fullest spiritual communion with the Established Church of England, but as one who looks with an eye of brotherly love, and with a heart

[1] See the Scottish Confession of Faith, 1560.

[2] Grub, ii. 50, 93, 97, 140.

[3] Grub, ii. 179, *seq.* Convention of Leith.

warmed (as he trusts) by feelings of a true and Christian patriotism, towards that vast majority of our Scottish fellow-countrymen who are not in communion with us, and consequently not with the Church of England. Though born and educated and ordained in England, I have devoted more than twenty years of my life to the service of the Scottish Church, not as one who sought for himself that sphere of duty, but as having been invited by the collective voice of its rulers [1] to come over and help them; and thus, having no theory of my own to serve, no likings or dislikings of my own to gratify, I live, if it please God, mainly to endeavour to promote what I believe to be the best and highest interests of the country into which I have been adopted; and the best and highest interests not of that single country only. Nothing can be more manifest than that the interests of Reformed Christianity throughout the world depend chiefly upon the welfare of the Church of England; and, I may add, upon the welfare of that most flourishing and extensive of all the branches of our Communion, which owes the first germ of its Episcopate to our Church in Scotland—I mean the Church of the United States of America.[2] Nothing, I am per-

[1] (*a*) And, I may add, more especially by one who is at the present time (June 1886) the Prime Minister of the British Empire.

[2] The following words occur in a work (before referred to) by the Principal of the University of Aberdeen, Dr P. C. Campbell:—"The admirable Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States combines the advantages of Presbytery and Episcopacy." "On Ruling Eldership," p. 67. That Church is in communion with the Church of England, and with our own; and so might the "Church of Scotland" be, if it would adopt the same or a similar "admirable constitution."

suaded, can be more manifest, than that the welfare of the Church of England, and again, it may be added, of the American Church, and of the Anglican Communion wherever it is found, would be promoted, in no small degree, if the Church established in the northern portion of Great Britain were in a position no longer to weaken and embarrass, but to strengthen and co-operate with her southern sister, in the work —the gigantic work—which they have both to do for the good of their Christian, or should-be-Christian fellow-countrymen, not only at home, but abroad. Nothing can be more manifest than that the interests of the countless millions of human souls, yet living in Pagan, or semi-Pagan darkness throughout the world, require that, in communicating to them the blessings of the gospel of peace and love, England and Scotland should not appear as alien, or as antagonists to each other; but should act together as one[1]—not only in subjection to the same Lord, and in profession of the same faith, but as holding and recommending together the same apostolic order, the same evangelic truth. Nothing can be more manifest than that divisions (especially among those who dwell in the same land and who speak the same tongue) are among the greatest of all hind-

[1] (*a*) It was the testimony of Dr Norman M'Leod, in his interesting address to the General Assembly (1869) on his return from India, that home divisions are the bane of Missionary action abroad; and that we must take care above all things to endeavour to found, not this or that section of Christianity, but "a Church of India." But how is this to be hoped for, unless we are first to have "a Church of Great Britain"? As a Presbyterian, Dr M'Leod would naturally be prevented from reminding the General Assembly of the testimony of Dr Wolff, viz., that in all his travels in the East, he had found Episcopacy universal. See above, No. 7 of this series, p. 378.

rances to the acceptance of the gospel by those who have not yet received it; and it was as foreseeing this, and seeking to provide against it that our Lord, on the eve of His crucifixion, prayed to the Father for the visible unity of His Church, in order that the world (through this outward testimony) might believe in Him.[1] Nothing, I repeat, can be more manifest than each and all of these things. Shall it then continue to be said, that in matters of religion the waters of the Tweed have more effect to estrange and divide fellow-countrymen, than the Word of God and the prayer of Christ have power to combine and knit them together into one Communion? The descendants of the Scotch and English who fought against each other with such fatal rage at Bannockburn, at Halidon Hill, or upon Flodden Field, now vie with each other in spontaneous zeal to anticipate the aggression of an invader from whatever quarter he may come,—now fight, if they fight at all, by each others' side against a common foe. Alas! that they have not yet learned, for the most part, to kneel beside each other, as "striving together" in common prayer, as partaking together of the food of life; that they have not yet learned to practise together the same discipline, to wage together the same warfare, as confederates and auxiliaries against sin and Satan, the most insidious invaders, the deadliest enemies of us all. When the interior of Africa was to be explored, when the source of the Nile was to be laid bare, an Englishman and a Scotchman,[2] as representatives of their native lands, could work harmoniously together for their common

[1] St John xvii. 21.

[2] Messrs Speke and Grant.

ends. But when the way of salvation is to be made known to the unhappy tribes of that same continent, when life and immortality are to be brought to light to those who sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, this is not so. The harmony among the missionaries may indeed be personal, but it no longer represents the one fatherland. The lamented Bishop Mackenzie was in a position of a dissenter from the Church established in the country which had the honour to give him birth; and in order to place himself in communion with it, he would have been bound virtually to become a separatist from the Church of England; nay more, to deny what the universal Church has asserted from the beginning, and to assert what from the beginning the universal Church has denied!

From the circumstances to which I just now ventured to refer, I feel that I am entitled to speak in the cause of Scotland with the sympathies and affections, and with somewhat also of the knowledge, of one born in the land.[1] And speaking now in that capacity, far be it from me to grudge to any portion of our Colonial Church whatever warmth of interest may be felt, whatever amount of encouragement or succour may be afforded, in its behalf. But at the same time, I must confess I cannot witness without deep regret—what, nevertheless, I am compelled to witness far too commonly—not only the miserable unconcern, but the grievous ignorance which prevails among members of the English Church respecting the state and prospects of religion in the country which is nearer, and ought on many accounts to be

[1] See above, Preface, p. 552.

dearer, to England than any other. I need not hesitate to affirm, that to many Englishmen the affairs of the Church of the most distant British Colonies are better known, and would seem to be matter of far less indifference, than those of the neighbouring Church, whose deeply interesting and instructive history I have endeavoured to sketch in this discourse. And yet it is, I believe, impossible to overrate the influence which Scotland has exercised, is exercising now, and must ever continue to exercise, over the destinies of England and Ireland too, for evil or for good, in all respects,—political, social, and ecclesiastical. Considering the known characteristics of the Scottish people; considering how deep and strong (as their past history has shown) is their religious sentiment, and yet how it requires to be softened and enlarged under the operation of a system more catholic than that which, for the most part, they now hold,—no one can tell how much more than has yet been gained, they have still to gain from England; and, it may be added with no less truth, how much more England has to gain from them. Surely, then, it should be our pleasure, as it is our duty and our interest, to look towards each other. As members of the Anglican Church, it may be that you will find more disposition than you had expected on the part of your Presbyterian brethren in the north—many of whom, I need not say, are distinguished by all the graces which can adorn the character of the true Christian—more disposition, I say, to draw towards you, if the overture be made in a loving brotherly spirit, with the fullest recognition of their undoubted right (humanly speaking) to

order the affairs of their own Church in their own way.

The overture must be based, I say, upon no other ground than this—the recognised independence of both parties; and must proceed upon no other plea than the Christian brotherly desire to strengthen, legitimately, each others' hands in the common cause for the common good. We may rest assured that, if we do not retain our Christianity upon a national basis, as true catholics, we shall have it once more as false catholics upon a foreign, that is, upon a Papal one. The rule of our gracious Sovereign that now is, has been signalised to us by many and great blessings; and not least by the gathering together of brethren of the Reformed-Catholic Episcopate from all quarters of the globe for the recent Conference at Lambeth. It is, perhaps, too much to expect that the political union of Great Britain, which was effected in the reign of Queen Anne,[1] should be followed up and consummated by a measure sufficient to effect its ecclesiastical union in the reign of Queen Victoria; but it cannot be too much to hope that the eyes and hearts of good Christians of both countries may be directed towards a result so desirable, so necessary; that *our* kingdom of this world which is already one in Cæsar, may (in God's good time) be one also in Christ.

Meanwhile, our own Episcopal Church in Scotland is gradually advancing in its hold upon the population, and as we trust, in spiritual strength. Instead of the scattered remnant of less than fifty

[1] See the passage quoted from Bingham in No. 6 of this series, p. 288.

flocks, to which it was reduced at the end of the last century, it now reckons, under its seven Bishops,[1] nearly 200 congregations[2]—some of them among the largest and most flourishing which the country has to show. Nothing, I believe, can henceforward prevent or check the progress we are making,[3] and shall continue to make, but we ourselves. If we remain firm and stedfast, as we now are, in the great principles of the Reformation, without deviating from the guidance of Scripture as interpreted by the primitive Church; if we endeavour, as I trust we do, in faith and love, to set forth those treasures of Evangelical truth and Apostolic order, which, in the providence of God, have been committed to our trust; the eyes and minds of the Scottish people will not, I am persuaded, be closed against us. They will begin to perceive that *the Cause of our Church*

[1] The original fourteen sees are still retained in name, though the Bishops themselves are now only seven; several of the existing dioceses consisting of a union of two or three of the ancient ones. Thus,—Moray, Ross, and Caithness are united; St Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunblane are united; Glasgow and Galloway are united; Aberdeen and Orkney are united; Argyle and the Isles are united. No attempt, however, has yet been made since the Revolution to restore to the Church either Metropolitan or Archiepiscopal authority —our "Primus" having only a presidential position and one which is simply a matter of election among the Bishops, without being attached to any particular see.

[2] (*a*) Now, in 1886, upwards of 250.

[3] (*a*) "If Episcopalianism is weak in numbers, it is strong in quality. The mass of the Scottish gentry belong to its Communion, and in the large towns during the last 25 years it has received numerous accessions from the ranks of the best educated and most influential adherents of Presbyterianism." Dr R. Wallace (then minister of Old Grey Friars, afterwards Editor of *The Scotsman*) in "Recess Studies," 1870, p. 193.

is their own cause, inasmuch as it alone is able to consolidate the unity of the social body, not only as regards England, but also as regards themselves. For upwards of a century and a half, Presbyterianism, with every advantage of position and of political circumstances, has done its best (we must suppose) to gain over to itself the upper classes of the country, and confessedly, it has not succeeded.[1] On the contrary, as regards both the intelligence and the property of the country, it is daily losing ground. It remains to be seen whether our own more Scriptural, more primitive, and catholic system, if its members be not wanting, I will not say to themselves, but to the fellow-Christians among whom they dwell, may not succeed in recovering—as in duty they are bound to do—the middle and lower classes, lost to us for the most part by the natural operation of the penal laws. Only it must be done, if done at all, not in dependence upon any arm of flesh, but in faith, and in the consciousness of a better cause; with a single eye to God's glory, to the common good of this great nation, and to the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom throughout the world.

May you, my brethren, whom on this interesting occasion I have had the privilege to address, strive with us in your prayers, as endeavouring to promote this necessary result. May you, one and all, be led to enquire for yourselves—and encourage others to enquire—in regard to the work that is to be done

[1] (*a*) For proof of that statement, see the testimony of the late Principal Tulloch, quoted in No. 5 of this series, p. 259, *seq.*; also No. 9, p. 508.

for the blessed cause of Unity in the Truth—to be done, I say, in this instance, among those who live, not in the uttermost parts of the earth, but, as it were, at your next door; to be done for the sake of Christian communion, not with those whom you may never see, who may speak a different speech, and who are divided from you by barriers which it is impossible to remove, but with English-speaking fellow-subjects and fellow-patriots, whom the powers of nature and the policy of man alike combine to rivet together in the closest bonds. It is true that amongst us in the North, as regards the Church now established, the heaven-directed spire of the ecclesiastical edifice has partially to be built up afresh; but let it not be said upon this occasion, in the presence of such an audience, that the work on that account cannot be done. Let only somewhat of the zeal, somewhat of the care and labour, and self-sacrifice, which have been bestowed upon the reconstruction of this *material* fabric, be spent upon the *spiritual;* and then—fair and beautiful and magnificent as this result is, which we now witness, and over which we rejoice with holy thanksgiving—who could venture for a moment to compare it with the cause for joy and thankfulness which would then be seen, when, *our* Euodias and *our* Syntyche being of one mind in the Lord, the Zion of this favoured Isle, from North to South, would be built up again as a Church that is at unity in itself, to the glory of God, to the edification of the flock of Christ, and to the accomplishment of His own most holy prayer?

The following are the Subjects of this Series as already published:—

NUMBER I.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION.

NUMBER II.

OUR CHIEF DANGER AS A NATION: Its Cause and Remedy.

NUMBER III.

UNITY A DIVINE LAW OF UNIVERSAL OBLIGATION.

NUMBER IV.

PROVISION FOR OBSERVANCE OF LAW OF UNITY.

NUMBER V.

THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION IMPARTIALLY EXAMINED.

NUMBER VI.

REUNION OF THE CHURCH IN GREAT BRITAIN.

NUMBER VII.

PLEA FOR UNIFORMITY IN MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH.

NUMBER VIII.

RESPONSE OF EPISCOPALIANS TO MODERATOR'S APPEAL.

NUMBER IX.

THE MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

NUMBER X.

EUODIAS AND SYNTYCHE; OR THE SCOTTISH CHURCH IN ITS RELATIONS, PAST AND PRESENT, TO THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

INTRODUCTION.

AN interval of fifteen years elapsed between the date of the sermon in the last number of these "Appeals" and that of the Address which is now presented to the Reader. Within that interval (1867-82) I find nothing which I think it necessary to reproduce *in extenso*, as bearing upon the subject of the present series. During so long a period there had been no lack of other practical questions and matters of controversy to call for notice on a Bishop's part.

There had been discussion on the admission of Laity to additional powers and functions in our Church Synods—a subject into which I entered fully (advocating such concession to a large extent under proper safe-guards) in my Charge for 1870; and which I again touched upon in my Charges for 1875 and 1878.

There had been troubles concerning unauthorized or excessive ritual, and clerical insubordination, which had occupied my Charges in 1872, 1873, and partly also in 1874, but which, I am thankful to be able to state, have now for the most part passed away.

In 1875 a long speech made by me in our Episcopal Synod, and afterwards published, led to the meeting of the General Synod in the following year. My object was to urge (but as the issue showed, I did

not succeed) that when the proposed Synod met, it should, *inter alia*, (1) give canonical recognition to our Cathedrals; (2) restore to Trinity College its original status; and (3) provide for the meeting of our General Synod at fixed intervals.

There had been differences arising out of the change introduced into the working and constitution of Trinity College, to which I felt it my duty to draw the attention of Churchmen in our Diocesan Synod for 1876, and again in 1880.

In 1878 the second Lambeth Conference had been held; and my Synodal Address for that year was mainly taken up with its proceedings; and, as arising out of them, with the case of so-called "English Episcopal" congregations in Scotland, and with the reconstruction in Scotland of the Papal Hierarchy.

There had been occasion to speak at length upon the use and abuse of Congregational Hymnody, and upon the Temperance question, in 1879.

But more important than all, there had been going on, during ten years of that same period, the great work of the Revision of the authorized version of the New Testament, in which I had been invited to take part; and the results of which, especially in respect to the extent of the changes introduced—an extent which had appeared to me to be injudicious and carried further than our instructions warranted—were laid before our Synod, and before the Church at large in my Address for 1881. That Address called forth many expressions of approval in private letters; and one of them was of so much value in a practical point of view, that I am tempted to place the chief part of it upon record. It came from the late Mr John Henry Parker, the

well-known publisher, and eminent antiquary and ecclesiologist, whom I had not seen since my Oxford days. He wrote as follows; under date September 25th 1881:—

"Allow me to offer you my cordial thanks for your very valuable remarks on the Revised New Testament. This was just what was wanted by numerous Anglicans, who are astounded at the enormous number of alterations in the Authorized Version made by the Revisers, a large proportion of which appear to be quite unnecessary, and not at all consistent with the instructions of Convocation upon which the Revisers profess to have acted. A protest of this kind from one of them, and that one a Bishop in whom English Churchmen generally place more confidence [I omit an invidious and extravagant compliment], will give great satisfaction to all who are of that opinion. . . . May I ask, if you have printed it as a tract? If not, may I suggest that it should be done? and that it should be printed in such a form that it will bind up with the Revised Version. It might, I think, be sold for a penny, and largely distributed with very good effect. If you are not disposed to be at the trouble of this, I would undertake to get it done for you *gratis*. I have retired from business for many years, and write only as a Churchman of considerable experience, who has many opportunities of hearing the opinions of a large number of influential persons."

I declined the proposal thus kindly made, and have since rather regretted that I did so. But at the time I was unwilling to attempt to prejudice the favourable reception of the Revision, or to put myself forward in public opposition to the majority of my brother Revisers — further than I considered to be necessary for self-exculpation in addressing the Clergy and Laity of my own Diocese. The concluding portion of that Charge, as touching closely upon a chief topic of these "Appeals," may not improperly be inserted here.

"So much, then, concerning the execution of the Revision in general. But I must not conclude these remarks without making some reference to that one particular department of it which bears most directly upon our own position as Churchmen in this country —I mean *the nomenclature of the Orders of the Christian Ministry.* In dealing with the words which relate to that important point, the result—unsatisfactory as it is, from unavoidable necessity, in our present Version—has certainly not been rendered less so, but rather the contrary, in the Revised. I say, *unavoidable necessity:* because each of the three English names—Bishop, Presbyter, Deacon—has now a fixed and distinct meaning, not only in itself, but in relation to the others; whereas not one of the Greek words from which they are derived, and to which, accordingly, they might be supposed to correspond, has in the New Testament any such fixed and definite meaning, either in itself or in relation to the rest. The nomenclature was then in a transition or (so to speak) fluid state, which it is now impossible for us to represent accurately in translation, or otherwise than by description. For instance, the Greek word Ἐπίσκοπος, from which 'Bishop' is derived, *never* means 'Bishop' in the New Testament, not because the office did not exist, but because the name of the officer was then, Ἀπόστολος, or, as in the Book of Revelation, Ἄγγελος. In like manner, the word Διάκονος, from which 'Deacon' is derived, though used upwards of ninety times (if we include its derivatives), *scarcely ever* means Deacon—*never*, perhaps, till we come to one of the latest of St Paul's Epistles, the First to

Timothy; although we read of the creation of the office itself in an early chapter of the Acts (vi. 1-6); while Πρεσβύτερος, from which 'Presbyter' is derived, is used *both of age and office*, and of *office*, both *higher* as of *Apostles*, and *lower* as of *subordinate Clergy*. In circumstances such as these, translation becomes not only difficult but hazardous; and I cannot but think it would have been better to leave our present Version as it stands, against which, upon the whole, little or nothing can be said, and the case being one in which *to give complete satisfaction is impossible*. But what has our Revision done? In Acts i. 20, the traitor Judas had been deprived of his 'Bishopric,' to which, as an Apostle, he was justly entitled, till he voided it by sin and death, in order that ἐπισκοπὴ might be translated simply 'office,' and so correspond with the Old Testament translation of the same word in the Psalmist and elsewhere—with 'Gr. Overseership' in the margin. On the other hand, in Acts xx. 28, we have turned the Elders, or Presbyters of Ephesus, who are now rightly described as 'overseers,' ἐπισκόπους—that is, *in their respective flocks*—we have turned them, not into 'officers' or officials (as in consistency we ought to have done), but into 'Bishops,' which, in the sense of the English word, they certainly were not; while again, in 1 Peter v. 2, the Elders or Presbyters there, who are described as ἐπισκοποῦντες, are not allowed to 'exercise a Bishopric' (as in consistency they ought to have been), but are confined to the simple 'oversight' of their flocks, in accordance with the rendering of the Authorised Version. It is evident that changes and inconsistencies such as these are

calculated to increase perplexity rather than to remove it.

"I ought to add that, although at the first I made a point of being present at the meetings of our company, as far as possible, constantly and regularly, afterwards my attendance became much less frequent, partly because my difficulty of hearing increased so that I was unable to follow the discussions sufficiently, or to join in them with any comfort; and partly, also, because the more I saw of the work the more it appeared to me that we were going beyond the purpose for which, as I understood it, we had been appointed. Upon the whole, I attended 109 meetings (involving the travelling of 100,000 miles) out of the total number of 407 meetings during the ten years and five months which the work has occupied."

But to return. It was well, perhaps, upon the whole, that during the interval I have mentioned, the leaven of the movement in behalf of Unity was left in great measure to work quietly and of its own accord; and the consequent improvement at the end of that time may be seen from a comparison of the tone of the address of Dr Crawford, as Moderator of the General Assembly in 1876, and that of Dr Milligan, as holding the same office in 1882. Among other indications of the notice attracted by this change of sentiment, it is interesting to mention the weighty words of Bishop Benson of Truro, now Archbishop of Canterbury, in which, at his Diocesan Conference on October 20th of the same year, he "reminded" his assembled Clergy and Laity "of the near approaches (formerly incredible), to each other of the Scottish Episcopal and Established Presbyterian Churches;" and he went

on to say: "Let me commend to any who have not read them—as *voices of promise for the whole Church* —the closing Address of Dr Milligan, Moderator of the General Assembly of 1882; the speech of Principal Tulloch in the same Assembly; and," he did me the honour to add, "the first part of Bishop Charles Wordsworth's charge in the Synod of his United Diocese."

But although, as I have said, the question of Union had been, up to 1882, comparatively in abeyance since the date of the Lambeth Conference, and of my Sermon at Chichester in 1867, it must not be supposed that the subject had been altogether lost sight of, or that discussions bearing upon it more or less directly had not arisen meanwhile, particularly in the public journals, from time to time. Such certainly was not the case; and in order to render this historical retrospect more complete, and at the same time to suggest matter for reflection in regard to the future, I think it desirable to revert to some particulars which deserve to be placed on record as useful for warning or for guidance to those who may come after me.

1. Previously, in 1866, I had published "A Plea for Justice to Presbyterian Students of Theology and to the Scotch Episcopal Church," consisting of the series of letters which had passed between Principal Tulloch and myself in *The Scotsman* and *The Courant* with reference to the statement made by the Principal in a Lecture delivered to theological students at St Andrews and at Edinburgh, respecting the opinions of Hooker and Leighton upon the subject of Church Ministry and Government, and

which I considered incorrect, inasmuch as it attributed to both those good and great men a position of *indifferentism* upon that question. And I venture to think I proved conclusively that the said position could not, with a due regard to all our available evidence, be attributed to Leighton, and still less to Hooker. Such, at all events, was the conviction of a remarkably able and acute judge, the late Dr Rorison of Peterhead, who, in a complimentary letter which I received from him at the time (under date April 10, 1866), made the following remark :—"The very attempt to take Hooker captive and impress him into the service of a system of modern origin, or rather into a vague negation of the necessity of *any* system, is a symptom of that *disintegrating process* which will probably precede[1] in Scotland the reconstruction we so much need ; which may God hasten in His own good time."

2. In the autumn of 1868, September 24 (our Synod for that year having met at Duncrub Park in the spring, May 13), a Diocesan Conference of Clergy and Laity was held in Perth, at which I gave a long opening Address, tracing from the earliest times the formation of the present United Diocese, and its progress up to that year during my own Episcopate ; and then, passing to the consideration of our duties as Episcopalians, and speaking (as I well remember) under provocation from the repulsive attitude assumed by Dr Crawford as Moderator of the General Assembly, and by his subsequent assurance in the

[1] To judge from the Address of the Moderator of the General Assembly for the present year, and from Dr Hatch's Sermon at St Giles', that anticipation would appear to be now in the way of accomplishment.

newspapers that we must never hope for any relaxation in our favour of the Presbyterian ordination formula, I indicated that the time might come when, strenuous advocate as I had been (in common with most of our members) of the principle of an Established Church, we might feel it our duty to abandon that position in regard to the Scotch Establishment as it now exists. I said, *inter alia* :—" It is obvious that the effect of the present state of ecclesiastical matters in Scotland is, and will be, gradually to compel Episcopalians to become Voluntaries ; so long as they see that a system, which they must hold to be erroneous . . . is *obstinately persistent and immoveable in its error.* Whatever may be our opinion as individuals upon the abstract question of Church and State, we may reasonably consider that it would be better to have no Establishment at all than one which is *indissolubly wedded to false ecclesiastical principles*, and which, by its democratic or republican tendencies,[1] is slowly but surely undermining all that is most valuable of the British Constitution, both in Church and State. . . . . For my own part, I cannot but still hold and testify (as I have ever done) that the principle of Church Establishments is most certainly to be deduced from Holy Scripture, as the intention of Christ for the welfare of His Church and people, *whensoever and wheresoever the circumstances of each case will properly and*

[1] Such was the testimony given, many years ago, by the late Sir James Graham to Mr Baxter, then M.P. for the Montrose Burghs. The former having asked the latter what it was that made Scotland a country so much more Radical than England, answered his own question thus : " It is its Presbyterianism." Compare the similar testimony of Dr R. Wallace quoted in last number, p. 620.

reasonably admit; but then I must also avow that it is not Establishment of every kind which fulfils the teaching of Scripture or the design of Christ; and I can easily suppose that it may be necessary to suspend for a time the application of the principle in a case where its existing operation has the effect not only of confounding the immutable distinctions of truth and error, but also of appropriating to error the privileges and prerogatives of the truth."

It is to be hoped that we are now coming to better times, and that no occasion may be given to repeat those sentiments. But until we see some actual progress made towards re-approachment, I cannot lose sight of the possibility which I then contemplated, viz., that in the choice of evils—that is, between the continued support of our national Presbyterianism (*virtually* antagonistic, as it is, to the Established Church of England,[1] and *positively* antagonistic to the universal Church of Christendom for the first fifteen centuries) on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the adoption of the Voluntary system—in the choice between these evils we may be *obliged* to prefer the latter: "obliged," I say, because, holding, as we do, the divine obligation of the threefold Apostolic Ministry, we cannot *indefinitely* continue to uphold (further than the law requires us to do) a merely Presbyterian Established Church, which cannot be otherwise than detrimental to the divine ordinance both in this country and in England. And under these feelings we wait with

[1] "These two Churches [established in England and Scotland], as now existing are rather *antagonists* than allies."—Dr R. Lee, "Reform of Church of Scotland," p. 41.

no little anxiety—and some of us, it must be confessed, with undisguised impatience—for some further, some *practical* manifestation of that kindlier policy to which I have referred in the following Address; and not less, I may add, for some open repudiation of that unbrotherly spirit which can hold up to public scorn the author of these "Appeals" as "an idle dreamer;" while, at the same time, it is loud and forward in claiming our support for the defence of its own now threatened position;—knowing all the while that if Disestablishment were to take place, it would greatly tend both to the discomfiture of its own Communion now established, and to the increase and advancement of our disestablished and disendowed Episcopal Church. In saying this, I do, for my own part, most sincerely hope that the time may never come when earnest and intelligent Episcopalians will be *forced* by unrelenting conduct on the part of the Established Church to assert for themselves the position in its full extent which their Christian duty requires them to take—viz., to act as Churchmen first, and citizens aftewards.

3. In the following year (1869) Dr Norman Macleod was Moderator of the General Assembly, and gave an address characterised by "masterly power" and "an admirable spirit;" in which, however, the reference made to Episcopalians was (as has been too often the case in that Assembly) so little satisfactory that it called forth from me a long letter, published in the *Courant*, June 10, from which I quote the following extracts. We had been charged with "unchurching" Presbyterians and "rejecting their orders," to which I replied :—

"It is Presbyterians themselves who have rejected holy 'orders,' in the proper meaning of the word, having only a single rank in their clerical ministry; which it is true we cannot see our way, for the reason I have mentioned, to accept for ourselves. But . . . charity should endeavour to represent our position, as though we desired (which we truly do) not to judge or condemn others, however hardly we have been used by them, but simply to abide by that which appears to us the only justifiable and trustworthy course; or if there be any of us who presume to speak otherwise, who take upon themselves not only to disapprove as *irregular*, but to condemn as *unavailing* what our Church has not so condemned, I have not a word to say in their behalf."

This was the line taken up in my Synodal Address of last year, under the title "Non-Episcopal Ordination fairly considered," which will form the next and concluding number of this series. The same letter went on to say:—

"On the other hand let me ask, with all due respect, why should the candour and the love of truth which has admitted" [this Dr N. Macleod had done] "that 'Common Prayer' would be an improvement upon the present mode of Presbyterian worship, stop short there? Why should it not go on and say, I wish we could devise some method by which due investigation—not like that of the Westminster Assembly, based upon a foregone conclusion—would bring us nearer to the historically-ascertained platform of the Primitive Church; which, retaining our existing Church Government by General Assembly, Synod, Presbyteries, &c., might restore to us, together with 'Holy Orders,' properly so called, Apostolic Prelacy, Apostolic Confirmation; some method which, avoiding the exorbitancies and anomalies of the English system—Overgrown Dioceses, State-appointed Bishops, Disuse of Synodical Action, Exclusion of Laity—might yet bring us into inter-communion, for our common mission work both at home and abroad, with that which is by far the most important body of Reformed Christianity in the world—the Church of England;

some method which, fully and carefully explained alike to all classes, high and low, rich and poor, in the true light of Scripture and of historical fact, might reunite them to each other in the house of God, and at the table of their common Lord? I must again repeat all that we Episcopalians want is 'a searching enquiry in regard to truth.'" [Words used in Dr N. Macleod's address.] . . .

"In the meantime, why should not Dr Macleod and Dr Tait[1] lay their heads together, and with the aid of a small committee, including one or more Episcopalians and Free Churchmen—O! that Dr Chalmers had been still living to preside over such a committee!—endeavour to ascertain whether some advance might not be made, upon sound principles, towards the gradual removal of the existing anomaly, whereby all honest and consistent Presbyterians and Episcopalians are now reduced to appear in *the eye of the State* both Churchmen and Dissenters, according as they may happen, for the time, to be on this or that side of the Tweed! Certain I feel, though I am not conscious of any 'revolutionary eagerness,' that if something of this kind be not done, and done speedily, the removal of that scandalous anomaly will be effected erelong in a way which cannot fail to be equally disagreeable to both Church Establishments, but whether still more scandalous and disastrous to religion itself than the present state of things I do not take upon me to determine.—I am, &c."

4. In the Charge which I delivered at our annual Synod, two years afterwards, viz., in 1871, I find a remarkable echo to the expression, "scandalous anomaly" used in that last sentence. I had quite forgotten the passage—including the quotation from Mr Goldwin Smith—but it deserves, I think, to be reproduced. I had been speaking at large, (1) Of matters concerning Primary Education;[2] (2) Of

[1] Just then made Archbishop of Canterbury, having before been Bishop of London.

[2] See Introduction to No. 2 of this series, p. 54, *seq.*

our duty as Preachers of the Gospel, and of the call made upon us to aim at a more careful and more cultivated style in our sermons than was necessary in former times, both on other accounts, and especially in consequence of the vastly improved energy and ability of the Periodical Press of all kinds, now accessible to all classes; and towards the conclusion, I took some notice of an article which had recently appeared on "Church Tendencies in Scotland," in a volume edited by the then Principal of Edinburgh University, the late Sir Alexander Grant, and entitled "Recess Studies." The author of the article was an able and well-known Minister of the Established Church (Dr R. Wallace), and the following is a portion of the remarks which I made upon it:—

"Setting aside the justice or injustice of the writer's estimate, the point to which I wish to draw the earnest attention of our lay brethren is this. Here we have a Presbyterian writer, selected by no less an authority than the Principal of the University of Edinburgh to give to the public an impartial view of Church tendencies in Scotland, and what does he say of *us?* He has nothing to allege against Episcopalianism in itself; he finds nothing to censure in that of which some of ourselves are apt to be so much afraid, viz., any endeavour on our part to extend to others the benefits of our Church; he even entertains no apprehension apparently that our so doing would be liable to be misconstrued and to give offence; but what does he object to? What does he think is injurious to our cause, as regards the sentiments of the middle and lower classes, *in the conduct of our Laity*, no less than weak ineffective preaching is injur-

ious *on the part of our Clergy?* I repeat, this critical friend of ours does not suggest that the people of Scotland are hostile to the Prayer-Book—quite the reverse; he speaks of the self-recommending superiority of our worship as a means of meeting the religious instincts (p. 201, see also p. 193): neither does he suggest that they are hostile to the principle of a well-regulated, *i.e.*, constitutional, Episcopacy (combined, as our own is now combined, with synodical government); on the contrary, this, he says, is what *Presbyterianism is felt to require by some of the wisest of its own members:* but he tells us we are wanting to ourselves—the Clergy, for the reason before specified,[1] and the Laity because *they are exclusive*, because *they are uncommunicative*, because they show little or no desire to extend to their less wealthy brethren the superior benefits which he admits they possess themselves. Surely this should be a useful lesson to those whom it concerns, not only from the highest of all considerations, but even upon lower grounds. They have been too apt to think that the only way to retain (so far as they do still retain[2]) their social and political ascendancy was to keep their religion to themselves. For my own part, I have long been of opinion, *it was the surest way for them to lose it.* And it is a satisfaction to me to find that the conviction which I entertain, and have more than once publicly expressed to this effect, is virtually confirmed by one whose judgment, if not philoso-

[1] "As long as Episcopalianism remains *weak in preaching*, as it is at present, it will fail to attract the people," p. 201.

[2] "The Scottish gentry have not much weight with the people." *Ibid*, p. 201.

phically and patriotically impartial, would naturally be warped in a direction opposite to my own.

"And here I should close these remarks were it not that the same writer, in addition to the more general criticism which concerns us all, has bestowed some further notice upon myself in particular, to which, after all that has been said, it might seem affected or uncourteous not to allude. He represents, then, in no harsh or unkind terms, that my various attempts, since I became Bishop, to advocate the cause of a united Church for the United Kingdom, or, in other words, to endeavour to open the way for legitimate intercommunion between the Established Church of this country and the Established Church of England, have, even by my own confession, proved abortive.[1] To a considerable extent this is true *as regards present appearances.* Besides the obstacle of the Presbyterian formula of Ordination, which forbids all Ministers and Elders to give any public token whatever of their sympathy with such attempts, inasmuch as it binds them never to endeavour, directly or indirectly, the prejudice of the

[1] This probably refers to a letter of mine which appeared in *The Scotsman*, December 13, 1869, and which dealt more especially with the political aspects of the question of Union, as rendered less hopeful by the Disestablishment of the Irish Church in the summer of that year. In the same letter, contemplating the *good* which might arise to ourselves out of the *evil* of Disestablishment in Scotland, I drew attention to the fact that several of the theological professorships at our Universities had been founded since the Reformation *in the interests of Episcopacy*, and yet Episcopalians as such are now excluded from them. The statement led to a somewhat keen and lengthy controversy respecting the foundation of the Divinity Chairs in Edinburgh and Glasgow, in which the late Dr Crawford took a prominent part. No attempt was made to question my statement in regard to Aberdeen.

entire Presbyterian system as it now exists ;—besides this obstacle, the attempts in question have been still further thwarted by the combined influences of the civil power in the very highest quarter, and of ecclesiastical latitudinarianism, recommending itself both to the court and to the country by talents and cultivation of no ordinary kind. *It remains, however, to be seen what is to be the result of this antagonistic policy.* My own opinion upon the subject was plainly expressed in the Address which I delivered at the opening of our mixed Conference in September 1868. I then said—'If either an Established Church in this country or an Established Church in England is to be preserved, it can only be by their being brought into harmony with each other.' Mere indifferentism in regard to both—the view which, for the reasons I have mentioned, is now in the ascendant—will not answer the purpose. . . . Since then we have seen the disestablishment of the Irish Church carried into effect (with or without wise and sufficient reasons), and in consequence the increased activity of the Liberation Society. Meanwhile my attention has been drawn to a pamphlet written by Mr Goldwin Smith, which that Society has pressed into circulation, and in which are to be found these words:—'The State, led by political exigencies, accepted, at the Union with Scotland, *the absurd and fundamentally sceptical position* of establishing one religion on the north and another on the south of the Tweed.' 'The absurd and fundamentally sceptical position,'—so it appears, and I think justly, to this able and thoughtful writer of the ultra-Liberal school. It is of the

utmost importance to us, most of whom are inclined to strengthen and *improve*, rather than destroy, the existing institutions of the country (and I have no hesitation in saying that both Established Churches appear to me to be capable of *improvement* by mutual co-operation [1])—it is, I say, of the utmost importance to us to endeavour to amend that *sceptical position*. And, as a first practical step in that direction, I would venture to suggest that all, to whatever religious communion they belong, who are favourable to such amendment, should seek, by petition or otherwise, to induce the Courts of the Established Church of Scotland to consider whether some relaxation might not, *beneficially to themselves and to the interests of the nation at large*, be introduced into their present forms of subscription, so as to bring them into greater harmony with the more liberal spirit of the similar forms now in use in the Church of England. There have been signs of late which lead us to entertain the hope that a movement of this kind might eventually open a way (under God's blessing) whereby we might be enabled to avert the fearful judgments which the national abandonment of all religious profession may have tended to call down upon a neighbouring land, and may not unreasonably be expected to entail upon our own,[2] according to the denunciation of the great Evangelical Prophet in speaking of the Christian Church :— 'The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish ; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted.' "

[1] See my paper read at the Carlisle Church Congress, Sept. 30, 1884.

[2] Do not we see this at the present moment in imminent danger of being fulfilled in Ireland? Has not the government of that country been rendered more and more difficult since the Disestablishment of the Church?

5. I pass as lightly as I can over several circumstances which occurred about that time, and which ought not to be altogether omitted, if this retrospect is to be a faithful one, because they bore upon our prospects of reconciliation, and, it must be confessed, with injurious effect.

I have now before me an anonymous letter, dated October 9, 1871, from a stranger, and signed "a Minister of the Church of Scotland," in which the writer, referring to a case then recent—the case of an English Bishop, and afterwards of an Archbishop, officiating in the kirk of a Highland parish, and the questionable attempt subsequently made to explain and justify what in fact required no justification —thus expresses himself:—

"What a mistake —— has made! I deeply regret it, for I am one of the ministers of the Church of Scotland who would wish to draw near to the Church of England. I have written and acted for this end. *Now all is over.* All your Christian and conciliatory labours for years are lost. The spirit manifested .... shows us distinctly that it is folly to dream of holding out to Scotch Episcopalians the olive branch of peace. I have a deep personal regard for you, for a reason you know not, and so take upon me to advise you never more to speak in public of drawing together 'the two Establishments' unless ... be disavowed. Nothing for many a day has so thoroughly roused—even in myself—the old Presbyterian spirit.... In my own breast there are the two emotions of regret and anger."

Again, only a week or two later in the same year, October 1871, another cause for regret arose, when Bishop Ewing, who had been kindly invited by Dr Caird, as Principal of Glasgow University, to preach to the students in their magnificent new building,

was prevented from doing so, though not from any unwillingness on his part. Perhaps there had been some misunderstanding; at all events the mistake was rectified some time after when Dr Sandford, of Edinburgh (now Bishop of Tasmania), performed that duty on a similar invitation. And once a year, for the last three years, I myself have been glad and thankful to have the privilege of addressing the students of the University here, in deference to the request made by themselves, with the hearty concurrence of the esteemed Minister of the College Church. And a few months ago the Principal and Professors of the University of Aberdeen did me the honour to invite me to give an Address to their students in the course of their last Winter Session; which accordingly I did on Sunday evening, February 21, in the Hall of Marischal College.

One more misfortune of the same kind, as tending to overcloud our prospects of reconciliation, may be mentioned here, though it did not occur till the summer of 1876. I allude to a sermon preached on a special occasion, and afterwards published, and widely and obtrusively circulated, in which we were made to claim for ourselves the title of "The Church of Scotland,"—an assumption which, while it could do no good, would be certain to give a check to the friendly feelings of Presbyterians, and to provoke the contrary. This, when private remonstrance had failed, I ventured (though not without incurring some share of obloquy) to point out in a letter sent to the public journals, with the view of preventing similar provocations on our part for the time to come.

6. In 1872 I published "The Outlines of the Christian Ministry delineated . . . with a view to the reconciliation of existing differences concerning it, especially between Presbyterians and Episcopalians:" a work which, I am glad to say, has been approved and found useful by the American Bishops. It was dedicated "to my Fellow-labourers from Scotland in the work of Revising the Authorised Version of the New Testament," as representing the highest Theological Scholarship of each of our Three Presbyterian Churches—Established, Free, and United Presbyterian; and in the hope that some one of them would have taken up the subject from their point of view;—but this has not been done, nor has a reply been forthcoming, so far as I am aware, from any other quarter.

7. It was said that my Charge for 1875 (October 6) showed signs of "great despondency." If it were so, it was only natural. The renewed troubles in connection with St Ninian's, Perth, were at their height; and a fire had broken out at Trinity College, which, with or without sufficient reason, drove the theological students into Edinburgh, where they still remain. Nevertheless the Charge received a full and impartial and withal very kindly notice in quarters where I had little reason to expect it; particularly in leading articles of the *Perthshire Advertiser* (Liberal) and of the *Glasgow News* (Conservative). It took for its subject the principal topics which had been discussed at our first Church Congress, held in Edinburgh in the autumn of the previous year; topics embracing (1) The past and present position of our Church; (2) Methods to be

adopted for the improvement of our Finance; (3) Our need of the formation of strong centres rather than the multiplication of small Incumbencies, of a system of Curates, and of a larger supply of indigenous Clergy; (4) Of the true policy of our Church in regard to Education; and it concluded by touching "upon the relations between Episcopalians and Presbyterians" in a way to which the editor of the latter journal did ample justice.

8. In 1879 appeared my "Remarks on Bishop Lightfoot's Essay on the Christian Ministry;" a small volume called forth principally by a sermon of Dean Stanley's preached at Glasgow on a special occasion, in which he had put an interpretation upon the Bishop's views as favourable to Presbyterianism to an extent certainly not warranted by his argument taken as a whole. A second edition of the "Remarks" was published in 1884.

9. In 1880 my Charge dealt mainly with the dismemberment of Trinity College; but a speech delivered at Ballachulish a few days before by the Duke of Argyle was of such a kind that it appeared to challenge notice;[1] and a part of what I had to say in reply to it will be seen in what follows:—

"The only statement approaching to an argument

[1] Unhappily the Duke of Argyle in early life brought himself into collision with our Church in a way which could not fail to be deeply distressing to both parties, and which, together with historical associations and hereditary antipathies, would naturally tend to warp his judgment. See, for instance, in the *S. E. Journal* for December 1851, a notice of his attack on Bishop S. Wilberforce; and also his speech made at Glasgow, October 20, 1885, in which, while defending the Scottish Church Establishment, he went out of his way to attack Episcopacy. See Introduction to next No. p. 679.

in the Duke's speech is this:—'I believe,' he says, 'that the historical process by which one bishop came to exercise dominion over all the other bishops of the Church is precisely the same historical process by which one presbyter came to assume authority over the other presbyters of the Christian Church. Holding this view, I am amongst the number of those who would say to my Presbyterian fellow-countrymen, do not sacrifice *anything* of your ancient traditions [1] and your national opinions for the sake of joining the Episcopal Church, or any other Church on earth.' But suppose it can be shown that this view, however specious and plausible at first sight, is nothing more; that it will not bear the touch of closer investigation. I can tell the Duke of Argyll how it came to pass that Episcopacy, in Western Christendom, gradually culminated in Popery; viz., because the Pope was Bishop of Rome, and Rome was the capital of the civilised West. But if the Duke's view be correct, can he—or can any man—inform me how it has come to pass that in the civilised East—the cradle of Christianity—while Episcopacy has been all along universal, Popery has never been recognised from the beginning until this day? [2] It was this unquestionable fact that convinced Dr Joseph Wolff (see his "Travels in Bokhara"), that not Presbyterianism (of which no trace whatever could be found anywhere in the East), but the three-fold ministry of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons must be *apostolic, scriptural, divine.* No; the Duke's

[1] It is curious to see the claim of "*ancient* traditions" put in for Presbyterianism.

[2] See above, Number 2, p. 74, note.

analogical view, which leads him to recommend his Presbyterian fellow-countrymen to have nothing to do with Episcopacy, is (as I have said) specious, but it has no real force."

10. In the winter 1880-81 the series of St Giles' Lectures began with a course upon "the Scottish Church from the earliest times." The scheme was one which in design, and for the most part in execution also, deserved highly to be commended. But in the views taken of the period since the Reformation there would naturally be points upon which it was desirable that the Scottish public should know the sentiments of Episcopalians, provided they were expressed in a spirit thoroughly fair and charitable, and, as far as possible, uncontroversial. Our own Cathedral in Edinburgh appeared to be the fittest place for such a purpose; and accordingly I was invited to take up the subject there on two consecutive Sundays, May 8 and 15, 1881. The result was afterwards published under the title of "A Discourse on Scottish Church History, from the Reformation to the present time," with prefatory remarks, &c., in a small volume, of which an unknown benefactor ordered 1000 copies to be sent to as many Presbyterian ministers at his own expense.

In a letter which I took occasion to write to *The Courant* in that year on the results of the "Infirmary Collection" in Edinburgh—and, inasmuch as those results were highly creditable to our Church in comparison with others, "the claims of Episcopalians" consequent thereupon—I was led to refer to the fifth Lecture of the St Giles' course in reference to a point which, not having touched upon it, I

think, before in these "Appeals," I desire now to bring under the reader's notice. The following quotation will show to what I allude:—

"The able and estimable author of the fifth Lecture [Dr Donald Macleod] could not indeed refrain altogether (as neither did his gifted and lamented brother) from alluding in a tone of suppressed complaint to 'the landed gentry who stand aloof from the Church of Knox'—a statement which, by-the-bye, I venture to think, will not bear examination, because the Episcopal Church at the present day is quite as near to the Church of Knox as is the Presbyterian Church. But however this may be, it is doubtless true that 'the landed gentry' for the most part have not ceased to remain adherents of our Church, notwithstanding the appeals continually made to them by eminent Presbyterian writers and speakers so to do. And why is this? In these days of freedom of thought and action I can only suppose the reason is that 'the landed gentry,' having had in many, probably in most, instances early opportunities of comparing the two ecclesiastical systems (which, unfortunately, the great majority of their less favoured neighbours and dependents have not had), they have seen cause to prefer the Episcopal. Nor does any one now ever venture to tell them they are *wrong* in so doing upon any other ground than this—viz., that they ought not to follow their own choice or conviction, but submit them to *the less experienced and less cultured understandings* of the popular majority! This may be Radicalism; it may be Liberalism; but I can discover in it none of the elements of genuine Patriotism, or of an enlightened and saving Conservatism."

It was in the next year that the following Synodal Address was delivered.

I am unwilling to close this brief retrospective survey—preparatory, as it is, to the termination of these "Appeals" in the next number, and designed to form a sketch of one main portion of my official

work during the period which it embraces—without some expression of my sincere thanks to the editors of *The Scotsman* and *The Courant* for the valuable assistance which, all along, they have so courteously afforded me by giving circulation (which without that assistance I could never have obtained) to the views and sentiments which, upon public grounds, I have desired to advocate; and also to the editors of our two Perthshire journals on both sides of politics, the *Constitutional* and the *Advertiser*, who, while freely delivering their own judgments, have not unfrequently shown, if not much sympathy with my cause, much kindly feeling and goodwill to myself personally. Nor can I make a less grateful acknowledgment to the editors, past and present, of the *Fifeshire Journal.*

CHARLES WORDSWORTH,
Bishop of St Andrews.

July 8, 1886.

POSTSCRIPT (see above, p. 612.)

"Complaints of the antiquated character of the Westminster Confession are common. Were all the clergy to speak out in public what they think and say privately, it would probably be found that at least *the half of them, and that by much the most intelligent half*, are more or less discontented on this subject. The Westminster Confession, as is well known, is *greatly more precise in its definitions, and extensive in its range of topics, than the Anglican Articles.* Notwithstanding this, every clergyman at his ordination is made to declare that he sincerely owns and believes the *whole* doctrine contained in it to be founded upon the Word of God, &c., &c., &c., and that he disowns *all doctrines, tenets, and opinions whatsoever contrary to and inconsistent with* the Confession."—Dr Wallace, in "Recess Studies," p. 213, see also p. 214.

PROSPECTS OF RECONCILIATION

BETWEEN

PRESBYTERY AND EPISCOPACY.

[In this Address, having first noticed the main events which had occurred in the administration of the Diocese during the past year, I proceeded to speak upon topics of more general interest, as follows:—]

Encouraging Address of Moderator of the General Assembly.

Remembering that there have been times at which I have felt it necessary to complain of the want of a just and charitable recognition of our position and claims on the part of our brethren of the Established Church, and that not least in the proceedings of their General Assembly, I hasten to acknowledge that a kinder, fairer, and more conciliatory spirit appeared to prevail — though still not altogether without exception—in the Assembly for the present year. More especially, I am sure, we must all have read with unfeigned satisfaction the closing Address of the Moderator, Dr Milligan. It may be said, I believe with truth, that a nobler or more memorable manifesto, if I may so call it, has never proceeded from the occupant of that chair. I can remember

other Moderators' Addresses, each memorable in its way, such as that of Dr Bisset in 1862, and that of Dr Pirie in 1864, both emanating from the same northern quarter; which might seem to indicate that in Aberdeen at least the spirit still survives of the olden time, when Episcopacy and Presbytery were not only fain to look each other fairly in the face, but loath to think that the discord which had, unhappily, broken out between them, must needs be hopelessly and endlessly perpetuated. For my own part, as I had not forgotten how Professor Milligan had spoken ten years before — viz., in May 1872, when he went as the principal member of a delegation from the Church of Scotland to the General Assembly of their Presbyterian brethren in the United States of America, then met at Detroit—not having forgotten, I say, the more than kindly tone in which he then spoke of the efforts which had already been made for some years previous on our part to advocate the cause of Unity, I was not unprepared for those enlightened—and, what is more, those brotherly—Christian sentiments, to which, as Moderator, he gave such weighty expression, especially towards the close of his Address. In his speech at Detroit—according to the authorised report, published in the American General Assembly's Journal —having referred to schemes in this country for the reunion of Presbyterians among themselves, he went on to say—

"Nor would it be right in me altogether to pass over the fact that there are many in the Church of Scotland who look onward to a still more comprehensive union—to one embracing not only the three large Presbyterian Churches, but the Epis-

copal community of Scotland too. Strange to say, this last phase of the movement has originated in the Episcopal Church itself, where"—I omit the complimentary terms with which the speaker was so good as to introduce my name—"the Bishop of St Andrews has through a long series of years taken every opportunity of advocating the scheme. That there are difficulties in the way of this it is impossible not to see; but it may be doubted if, great as they are, they are greater than the difficulties that beset the path of those who are striving to accomplish the smaller unions. I am not sure that they are not less, and that the prospect of gathering again together the powerful landlords, who are for the most part Episcopal, into one flock with their dependents, together with the many lettered and cultivated among the inhabitants of our towns, who have of late years been feeling the attractions of the Episcopal constitution and service,[1] would not awaken an even larger amount of sympathy and enthusiasm in its favour than that of uniting Presbyterians alone. What may come of any of these movements after union it is impossible to say; but this much, at least, is obvious, that the spirit at the bottom of them is the spirit of God; and that they can hardly fail to foster that love which, more than all other gifts, is the very bond of perfectness."

Remarkable words! which, in the report of that Address, as reprinted in this country by the principal organ of the Established Church, were, I am sorry to have to say, all suppressed—not, I have reason to believe, with the speaker's good-will, but probably because they were thought at that time to be going further than was quite agreeable to certain influential persons among our Presbyterian friends at home. Be this, however, as it may, it is interesting to compare that passage with the words which the same speaker has now uttered in a way which it is impossible to conceal—delivered as they were with all the

[1] See the similar testimony of Dr Wallace, quoted in No. 10, p. 587.

publicity which our own Scottish General Assembly could give to them, and with all the authority which they could derive from its Moderatorial chair, and subsequently published, as they have been, by the Moderator himself, in deference to special request. As if taking up the thread of his discourse at Detroit ten years ago, and again speaking of the Unity which we have need of in this country, and which is so earnestly sought and prayed for by many, he proceeded thus :—"The body most difficult to deal with would in all probability be the Episcopal Church. It is vain to say," as, no doubt, some had said in 1872—"Let that matter alone. Upon what principle can you let it alone? When Christian union is spoken of, the starting-point must be Christian ; and starting from that point, we are not entitled to omit any body of Christians until it is distinctly shown that the difficulties of conciliating it are insuperable. They may be so here, but it has not been shown that they are so. On the contrary, there is much to draw us to the Episcopal Church of Scotland—far more, I would fain say, did I not know how delicate is the ground upon which I am treading, than to the Church of England." (Let me here interpose the remark that Unity with us *must* and *would* in all ordinary course involve Unity with the Church of England, and that any attempt to bring about Unity with the Church of England except through us—though a notion, I believe, entertained by some—would be found, I am persuaded, a mere idle dream.) "The earliest and best of our reformers," the Moderator added, "had no objections to much that the Episcopal Church retains in doctrine, worship, and government ; while, on the other hand, Scottish Episcopacy,

especially in its earlier times, retained many Presbyterian elements. If in later times a spirit of mutual animosity prevailed, it was in no small degree because of temporary causes of alienation which might pass —which have in great measure passed—away. These causes were, indeed, more political than religious, and they were deepened by that folly and sin on both sides which all parties now equally bewail."

Again I say, "remarkable words," for which God be praised! But Aberdeen is not the only centre of light and learning from which, as we might expect, such sentiments have proceeded. I rejoice that St Andrews has come forward *pari pasu* in the same course. The views of the Moderator had been anticipated some days before in the same Assembly by the Principal of St Mary's College in proposing a resolution on the subject of Disestablishment. After stating that the attitude of the General Assembly and of the National Church had for many years been one of brotherly feeling towards all Christian communions in Scotland, and especially towards the Presbyterian Churches which had sprung from it, Dr Tulloch made use of these words:—"I may say for myself that I extend that sympathy and brotherly interest beyond the pale of Presbyterianism. I am not one of those who have been jealous of the Christian influence of our Episcopal brethren, and of the much good work among the influential classes that the Episcopal Church is doing in Scotland. Nay, I am one of those who recognise that Episcopacy has a certain historic root in Scotland," and therefore is not a *mere exotic*, as has been sometimes said of us. "I am perfectly certain," he continued, "that the

Church of Scotland has no warmer friends than many who adorn the Episcopal Church of this country; and it would little become us to look with coldness upon the great work they are doing, or to refuse them brotherly sympathy in their work." And these sentiments were received, we are told in the newspaper reports, with repeated "applause." Nor is this all. Our other distinguished Principal (viz., of the United College) at St Andrews, in two temperate and impartial articles which appeared still more recently in a magazine (*Fraser's* for June and July), has given another healthy and encouraging sign of the same spirit; while our first parish Minister, through his many various and deservedly popular works of entertainment and instruction, has been long known as one who declines to look upon the existing condition of Presbyterianism in this country as incapable of improvement — perhaps I should rather say of development—or as sufficient to satisfy the advancing tastes and aspirations of a large proportion of his fellow-countrymen, both rich and poor.

It may be asked what good purpose I propose to myself in speaking to you of these things, or what is the practical value of remarks such as I have now brought before you. I answer, they are of use, if on no other account, yet, at least, because, circulated, as they are likely to be, through the indulgence of the newspaper press to these our Synodical Anniversaries, they serve to bring before the minds of the people of this country an important truth, which, being presented to them again and again, and from divers quarters, may, in God's good time, produce the desired fruit. They testify that we, Clergy and

Ministers of the Gospel, whether Presbyterian or Episcopalian—we who have to watch for the good of souls—are not content that the condition of disunion in which we find ourselves, most unwillingly and most unhappily, should be allowed to continue without remonstrance; that, as guardians and expounders of God's Word, we cannot consistently acquiesce in the flagrant disobedience thus shown to one of the most frequent and most emphatic precepts of that Word—viz., to shun divisions—any more than we can acquiesce in the most palpable violations of God's moral laws; in short, that we look upon our present state of aggravated schism as being—what indeed it is—a scandal and disgrace to our common Christianity. At the same time it is, no doubt, very undesirable that we should accustom ourselves to rest in mere generalities upon the matter, without attempting to come to closer quarters with the difficulties of the problem which we have to solve. I should be sorry indeed to think that the effect of this year's Moderatorial Address is destined to pass away unimproved, as that of Dr Bisset's passed away, and that of Dr Pirie's passed away, and that of the former address of Dr Milligan himself, at Detroit, so far as we in this country are concerned, has apparently passed away. And from this point of view I cannot avoid remarking that the arrangement by which, under the present Presbyterian system, the Moderator of the General Assembly discharges only for ten days the duties of the office which then virtually becomes defunct, until it is revived the next year under the same conditions—this arrange-

ment cannot but constitute a grave impediment in the way of carrying out improvements which each Moderator in turn may desire to effect. In former days, the disadvantage was not allowed to exist to the same extent. When great measures were to be passed, and great changes accomplished, it was not unusual for the same Moderator, after a longer or shorter interval, to be re-elected. For example, Andrew Melville held the office three times—viz., in 1578, 1581, and 1582. So did Alexander Henderson—viz., in 1638, 1641, and 1644. So did William Carstairs—in 1705, 1708, and 1711; and other cases might be named in which re-election was still more frequent; as that of Robert Douglas, who was Moderator five times between 1642 and 1651. It would seem to be a just cause for regret that, when necessity has arisen from more than one quarter for reconsidering calmly and dispassionately certain aspects in the history of the past, a practice so reasonable has been suffered to die out; and, whether or no it be now capable of revival, it is not, of course, for us to judge. But, in the meantime, we may be allowed at least to entertain a hope that those who have committed themselves to the expression of sentiments which indicate broader sympathies and a desire for closer and more brotherly relations than those in which we are now living, will not suffer themselves to rest in the mere expression of those sentiments, but will endeavour to bring them to some practical and permanent result. And it is in this hope that I shall now proceed to notice one or two points suggested in the remarks put forth within the last

few months by the eminent individuals to whom I have referred.

Origin and Causes of Disunion.

The first step required in every discussion which can reasonably be expected to lead to good effect upon the subject of Unity, is to consider *when* and *how* the parties estranged became disunited. In the case between Presbyterians and ourselves, the time, we know, was the period of transition from the unreformed to the reformed era in the history of our Scottish Church. That period of transition which, in its full extent, reached from 1560 to 1690, has been thus described in one of those recently published articles to which I just now alluded, by the Principal of our United College at St Andrews:—"In this century and a half of turbulence and disorder, when Superintendency, Tulchan Bishops, Melville Presbytery, Spottiswoode Episcopacy, the Covenant, Restored Episcopacy, and Moderate or Non-Covenanting Presbytery were jostling each other; when the whole kingdom was full of quarrelling, fighting, plotting, convulsions, reactions, and counter revolutions, the calm pursuit of knowledge was impossible."[1] And if this was true of knowledge in general, it certainly would not be less true of ecclesiastical and theological knowledge, the

[1] (*a*) *Fraser*, for July, p. 41. See also Burton, "Hist. of Scotland," vol. vii. p. 465. At the time of the Revolution "Scots Presbyterianism had scarcely a representative in the Republic of Letters. . . . There was no theologian then alive in Scotland whose writings have been admitted into the current theological literature of the world." Compare my Address to the Aberdeen Students, p. 19.

degraded condition of which before the Reformation had principally given occasion for all that disturbance. *Such, then, was the character of the period in which our disunion took its rise.* And how was it brought about? or, in other words, what was the main cause out of which it sprung? The simplest and surest answer to this question is to be found in the fact that we—that is, the first fathers of our Church as reformed Episcopalians — could not consent to commit ourselves to such a thorough separation from the unreformed Church of Scotland as that to which it is certain the first fathers of Presbyterianism did commit themselves.[1] Setting apart the subject of the Ministry, which had been so confused and darkened by mediæval Popery that at first few, if any, were able to see it in its true light,[2] the fact, as I have stated it, is sufficiently proved by the attempts—made on the one side and opposed on the other—to rescue, for example, the observance of the great Christian

[1] (*a*) It is sufficient to quote the following remarks from the valuable work of Dr John M. Ross (a Presbyterian), "on Scottish History and Literature," p. 219, *seq.* "The moral need for Reformation was probably not quite so great in England as in Scotland; but in any case the same *terrible severance from the past* was not made. . . . In Scotland a new religious world arose. Even those who are most deeply imbued with a reverence for the sanctities of the past, whether Roman or Genevan, recognise in the work of Knox a spiritual revolution so *intense*, *unsparing*, and *remorseless* as to place an almost impassable gulf between the two periods of Scottish History, the period that preceded and the period that has followed the destruction of the mediæval. There is perhaps no country in christendom where the historic sentiment in religion is so weak, where the religious imagination of the people is so thoroughly restricted, in its backward flight, to the age of the Reformation."

[2] (*a*) See above, No. 2, p. 75, and No. 5, p. 239, *seq.*

Anniversaries,[1] and of Confirmation by Bishops, aimed at in the Perth Articles of 1618 (rescinded in 1638), and of the use of liturgical worship aimed at in the Prayer Book of 1637. It is from this point of view that Principal Tulloch in his "Memoir of John Knox," more than twenty years since, was led to complain that the Scottish Reformation "in the beginning and at the end, retained no sacred inheritance of traditionary story binding it by beautiful links to the great Catholic past" (2nd edition, p. 334); and again, in his sermon preached before the General Assembly three years ago, to declare that "the true Church is historical in doctrine and ritual. No Church can, without injury, separate itself from the past — the inherited belief and traditions of Christendom" (p. 17). It is true that more recently we have witnessed an endeavour to assert for Presbyterianism, as now established, a continuity with the pre-Reformation Church; but when we remember how the first Reformed "Confession of Faith," put forth in 1560, repudiated, *inter alia*, "antiquity and lineal descent" as marks of the true Church (Art. xviii.), and how it denounced "the ministers of the Papistical Kirk" (or, "kirk malignant," and "horrible harlot," as it is also called) as "nae ministers of Jesus Christ" (Art. xxii.), it is plain that no amount of ingenuity can suffice to obtain from competently informed persons a moment's credit to such a delusion. I

[1] (*a*) How different is the position *now* taken up on that point by leading Presbyterians of the Established Church! For instance, Dr Milligan, in his Croall Lecture, speaks of "the series of Festivals which expressed the truly Christian and exquisitely beautiful idea of the Christian year," p. 68.

cannot suppose that Dr Milligan himself shares this delusion, though a passage of his Address might be so interpreted, where he says—"The Church of Scotland after the Reformation was not a new Church. There cannot be a new Church. A new Church would not be the Church. There may be offshoots from the Church. But the Church of Scotland was not an offshoot. She was the old Church in Scotland reformed" (p. 28). Rather, I should say, transformed, metamorphosed. At the same time I admit that the word "Reformed," in its ecclesiastical application, is not a happy one, and in its stricter etymological sense it may admit of the meaning which, I conceive, the Moderator intends. The question is—Would the first Reformers, who repudiated for themselves "lineal descent" from the unreformed Church, have been content with that meaning? Would they not have said—"We *are* making for ourselves *a new Church*"? And did they not in effect do this through the extent of the changes, the innovations, which they introduced, and through the *animus* with which they boasted of introducing them? (Compare Acts of General Assembly, 1645, p. 14). When Knox denounced his own Papal orders as a priest; when laying on of hands in Ordination was virtually forbidden by the First Book of Discipline, 1560 (chap. iv., sec. 3, and chap. xvi.)—to be restored, however, in the Second Book, 1578 (chap. iii., sec. 6); and when laymen, such as Erskine of Dun, were appointed to "superintend" Presbyters in the exercise of their spiritual functions, it would seem as if disconnection from the Church of the past could scarcely be carried further. But, however this may be, we hold that in

this particular the advantage is plainly on our side. Reformation with us, as with the Church of England, has not been a *transformation*, but a *bona-fide* continuation of the Catholic past, *minus* the abuses and corruptions of mediævalism—a continuation of the past *in the practice of Ordination by Bishops, in the observance of the rite of Confirmation, of liturgical worship,*[1] *and of the great commemorations of the Christian year;* but not in the usurpations of Popery, or in its additions to the Catholic creeds. After all, this matter of disconnection—or, to speak more correctly, as concerns ourselves, of recovery of liberty in our relations with the Papal Church—may fairly be regarded as a question of degree; and questions of degree are those which most readily admit of reconciliation and adjustment. On the other hand, the great and paramount advantage which Presbyterianism, as established, has over us, is this: through all changes, from 1560 downwards, it has clung to its General Assembly. The General Assembly has been, and still is, so to speak, its backbone. Justly described as "the most remarkable growth of the Reformation,"[2] it forms the connecting link between the earliest and latest reformed movement—the Knoxian movement of Superintendency in 1560, and the Carstairs movement of moderate or non-covenanting Presbytery in 1690; and it proves that the existing Established Church is, in the view of reason as well as of law, truly national. And most wisely,

[1] (*a*) This, also, no less than the observance of the Festivals of the Christian year, is now advocated by leading Presbyterians. See the first "R. Lee Lecture," recently delivered by Dr Story.

[2] Cunningham, "Ch. Hist.," i., 480.

if I may presume to say so, has the Moderator put the General Assembly forward as that around which we must all rally.[1] "We know," he says, "that this House has been, not only the bulwark of our religious, but the assertor of our civil liberties" (p. 4). Yes; and we also know that that House *did not repudiate Episcopacy, as such, in* 1560; *nor in* 1690 (though it caused it to be disestablished as an abuse—as a felt practical grievance in the hands of such men as Lauderdale) *did it attempt to deny its use, or disprove its Scriptural, historical, and (whether we look to Eastern or Western Christendom) its Catholic claims.*

It is, then, these two points of departure,—the departure of Knox, mainly upon ecclesiastical grounds, and the departure of Carstairs, mainly upon political grounds,—it is these to which we must revert in endeavouring to construct a basis upon which a prospect of reconciliation may be entertained.

For ourselves, we can truly say we sympathise with the aims of both departures. We join with Knox in repudiating the errors and aggressions of a

[1] It is interesting to trace the General Assembly through the annals of the nation in its Modern History. Coming into existence December 20, 1560, and then consisting of 40 members, of whom only 6 were ministers, it continued to meet, in increased numbers, once or twice a year, and in some years more frequently (with the exception apparently of 1585 and 1599) till 1602 inclusive. Between that year and 1638, six Assemblies were held, viz., in 1606, 1608, 1610, 1616, 1617, and 1618, but in 1638 and 1639 all their Acts were disallowed, and repudiated. In 1638, the meetings, discontinued during the previous 20 years, were resumed and continued yearly till 1653 inclusive, when they were suppressed under order from Cromwell and the Parliamentary Army, and did not take place again during the next 37 years, *i.e.*, till 1690; from which time until now the Assembly has not ceased to meet regularly once a year.

foreign Church—the Church of Rome—and in vindicating for the Laity a substantive position in the Church no less real and essential than that of the Clergy. We join with Carstairs in hailing the political liberty secured by the Revolution Settlement (and, humanly speaking, it could have been secured no otherwise), and in rejecting for the Church subserviency to despotic power, such as was practised under the Stuart dynasty. And the sentiments which I have already quoted from the Moderator's Address would seem to meet us upon both grounds. It is true that, as yet, in the history of the past the way has not been found for a permanent coalition between Prelacy and the General Assembly, though attempts towards it were made in the Assemblies of 1610 and 1616—attempts which, but for the undue interference of the Crown, might have proved successful. There is, however, I believe, nothing in the nature of things to prevent such a coalition.[1] And this, I suppose, is what the late esteemed Principal of Aberdeen, Dr P. C. Campbell, intended when, in his able and *unanswered* book on "The Lay Eldership," p. 67, he wrote—"The Protestant Episcopal Church of the American United States, by its admirable constitution, combines the advantages of Presbytery and Episcopacy." Moreover, something of the same kind must be contemplated by the Bishop [Moberly] of Salisbury, who, in the Charge

[1] (*a*) It is the statement of Burton (Hist. vii. 463)) that, "During the reign of Prelacy [after the Restoration] the Presbyterian Church Courts had not been broken up, . . . but still nominally, and in some cases really, existed. There was still the Kirk-session, the Presbytery, and the Synod, where, if it was held, the Bishop presided.'

which he delivered two months ago, advocated for the Church of England the endeavour "to build up a central body, not a Synod of the Clergy, but the Synod of the Church framed upon true Church principles. I shall probably be told," he proceeded, "that I am sketching out a constitution unknown to the primitive ages and inconsistent with the principles and practices of the best times of the early Church. As far as regards the practice of the early mediæval Church, I cannot deny the allegation; but I venture to assert that it is otherwise with the principles of the best ages. And I further venture to say that the gradual usurpation by the Clergy of the entire government of the Church, going on and becoming complete in the proclamation of the infallibility of the Bishop of Rome, was the early germ which has led to the gradually developed perfection of the Roman corruption of the Church. We cannot go back to mediæval times, but must look to the future. No one can imagine that the Clergy are ever again to become the sole rulers of the universal Church. Theory forbids it. History is full of warning against it." Such is the view of one of the most eminent Bishops now [in 1882] on the English bench.

But to return to the Address of our Scottish Moderator, Dr Milligan. There is, I must confess, one avowal which appears to me to be wanting in that otherwise just and fair representation. Speaking of the Disestablishment question, Dr Milligan lays great stress—and very properly—upon the fact that the teinds, or tithes, are not, in any strict or equitable sense of the term, national property; that

they were not given by the State, and cannot justly be taken away by it. But he omits to draw attention to the fact—surely a most important one in the argument as he urges it—that the original donors of the teinds—the landed proprietors of Scotland—were mostly forefathers of those who are now known as Episcopalians; and that, in the present day, they and their vested rights are represented by a greater number of persons who belong to our Church, than to all the Presbyterian bodies put together. The Moderator did indeed (as he intimated) refuse to listen to the unchristian policy which has been too much followed hitherto—viz., that *no notice is to be taken of us*—that we are (as he expresses it) to be "left alone;" and so far we applaud his courage—we thank him for his honest truth; but he failed to remind the favourers of that policy that more than one-half of the landed property at present tithed for the sole benefit of the Establishment is in the hands of members of our communion, men who do not belong to the Established Church, and whose fathers did not separate from it, because they were never Presbyterians.[1] But here, on the other hand, I also

[1] In a volume entitled "The Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland," which I shall have occasion to notice presently, the author, Dr Sprott, uses these words, p. 200 *seq.*: "After the Revolution, when a section [of the clergy] *separated*, and formed the 'Scottish Episcopal Communion,' &c." There must be some strange confusion and derangement of ideas in the mind of a writer, who, without intentional misrepresentation—which I certainly do not impute to Dr Sprott—can so express himself. The *differentia*—to speak logically—of the Body which he describes as "The Scottish Episcopal Communion" is its Episcopate. Had this Episcopate ceased, after the Revolution, to be one and entire, had a main portion of it renounced its proper nature, and, ceasing to be Episcopal,

may be reminded that, though the proprietors themselves are for the most part Episcopalians, yet their tenants and dependents are not; and that they (the proprietors) may fairly be expected, under the circumstances, to make provision for the worship and edification of the tillers and occupiers of the land according to the religious forms and methods of instruction which they themselves prefer. This is perfectly just and true, and I have no wish whatever to keep it out of sight. On the contrary, I desire to see it brought prominently forward as a valid argument in the eyes of all charitable and considerate men. Only let the argument be set in its proper light. Let it be borne in mind how this supposed preference has arisen in very many instances; viz., because during the whole of the last century—and the same continues still, though in a less degree—there was, generally speaking, no alternative for the poorer classes (however there might be, to some extent, for the wealthier) between Presbyterianism and no religion at all;[1] and I must add, because in

become Presbyterian, there might have been some pretence (though s ill no sufficient real ground) for such a statement *respecting the remaining portion of the Body*. But that was not the case. Every one of the 14 Prelates—2 Archbishops and 12 Bishops—*remained spiritually and ecclesiastically after the Revolution just as they had been before it*, only they were denuded of their endowments, and all other civil and secular privileges. And *the main portion* of the other constituents of the same Body, both clergy and laity, did the same. Their position in relation to the State was altered by superior force without their own consent—but that was all. And to speak of such an enforced change of position as *a separation* on the part of those who suffered it, is not only a palpable misnomer but a gross injustice. It reminds one of the so-called "fight" of the bully in the Roman Satirist:—"*Si pugna est, ubi tu pulsas, ego vapulo tantùm.*"

[1] See Appendix in next number of this series.

times past, I will not say through conscious untruth, but through insufficient or incompetent investigation, and through the violence of partizanship, a false gloss has been too often put upon the testimony both of Scripture and of history in regard to the matters upon which the differences between Presbyterians and ourselves mainly turn.

Theory of Twofold Ministry Examined.

I may now leave the Moderator's Address, and proceed to make some remarks upon a volume lately published by a learned Presbyterian divine, well known and much esteemed—I mean the minister of North Berwick, Dr Sprott; which, consisting, as it does, of lectures, delivered, under special appointment of the General Assembly, to candidates for the ministry at each of our four Scotch Universities, and dedicated, as it is, to Professor Milligan, then Moderator-designate, naturally possesses a special interest, and is entitled to receive more than ordinary attention. One of the lectures is devoted to the subject of Ordination, and although from the remarkable discussion on that subject which took place in this year's General Assembly, it became manifest that the teaching of Dr Sprott must differ widely from that of some other Presbyterian divines, even more distinguished and of professorial rank, yet the fact remains that his lectures were addressed, under the sanction I have mentioned, to the whole body of young men then studying divinity within the borders of the Established Church, and that their authority, so far as I am aware, has hitherto remained un-

challenged from any quarter. Upon this account I have felt it my duty to look carefully into them, and not less my duty to lay before you the result of my examination in regard to one or two particulars of principal moment and concern to us all.

In the first place then, it is important to observe the ground which is taken up in claiming for the Presbyterian ministry a *bona fide* Apostolic succession. "It is," we read p. 187, *seq.*, "the doctrine of the Church"—that is, the Church of Dr Sprott—"that Presbyters are the successors of the Apostles in all the ordinary functions of the ministry; and this excludes the claim of Prelates to ordain as an Order above Presbyters, leaving them only the same power to ordain as that which belongs to all who are admitted to the Presbyterate." Now that this is *not* the doctrine of *our* Church, nor of the Primitive Church, nor of the Church Universal either Eastern or Western, I need not tell you; neither need I produce the endless testimony of Fathers and Councils for the first 1500 years, who assert the contrary. Even Jerome himself bears witness, "Apud nos Apostolorum locum Episcopi tenent," *with us Bishops hold the place of the Apostles;*[1] and in that celebrated passage concerning the Church of Alexandria,[2] where he a Presbyter (who, be it remembered, kept up a constant feud with his own Bishop, John of Jerusalem) appears to be holding, as it were, a brief for Presbytery, the utmost he can say is, "Quid facit, *exceptâ Ordinatione*, Episcopus quod Presbyter non faciat?" *What does a Bishop do,*

[1] Epist. ad Marcell., 3, vol. i., p. 476.
[2] Epist. ad Evangel., 1, *Ibid.*, p. 1193.

that a Presbyter cannot do, except Ordination? EXCEPT ORDINATION; and elsewhere he excepts Confirmation also.[1] If Dr Sprott has any trustworthy evidence to confront with this, and with the countless other evidence to which I have alluded, it is much to be regretted that he did not produce it, and so far at least endeavour to relieve his Church from the unhappy predicament of standing outside the tradition of Universal Christendom in this respect. But he goes on to say—"*All* the Reformed Churches held that there are only two Orders in the ministry of Divine appointment—those of Bishop or Presbyter, and Deacon. The first of these was instituted by Christ Himself in commissioning the Eleven, and hence we read of no separate institution of this office as in the case of the Diaconate. When the Apostles originated the Diaconate, as recorded in Acts vi., the platform of Church government was complete as to its essential features, and it may be questioned whether any single Apostle had power to set up a new Office." What the venerable Bede will have to say to this view, we shall see presently. In the meantime, because we do not happen to read in "the Acts" of any formal Institution of an Order of Presbyters, we are to believe that the Presbyters ordained by Paul and Barnabas "in every Church" (xiv. 23), were placed by them at once in the same Order as their own; that *the* Apostles and *the* Presbyters who were gathered together in the Council at Jerusalem were of the same Order; and that there was no difference of Order between James and the Presbyters who were with him to receive St Paul

[1] See Dial. contr Lucif. 9, vol. ii., p. 140.

(xxi. 18). But Dr Sprott proceeds—"It is fully admitted, however, that there are traces of Superintendency in Scripture apart from that of the Apostles, as in the case of Timothy and Titus, and the frank acknowledgment of this should be made alike in the interests of Truth and Christian reunion." We gladly recognise the kindly spirit of this remark, and if Dr Sprott can prove the statement by which he goes on to balance, if not to neutralise, that concession, I shall not hesitate to confess that in much which I myself have previously written and published upon this question, I have been grievously mistaken. The statement I allude to is thus expressed. Such Superintendents, "whether called Bishops as in post-Apostolic times, or not, no more belonged to an Order of the Ministry above that of Presbyter, than did the Scottish Superintendents after the Reformation, or the Moderators of our Church Courts now. Episcopacy is in short, according to this view, but a phase of Presbytery; and there never has been nor can be any Ordination to the Ministry except by Presbyters, call them what you will" (p. 189). Let us see then what are the arguments adduced in favour of this representation, only premising in reference to these last words that all Bishops *are* Presbyters, in the sense in which the greater includes the less, but *it is not as Presbyters that they do now, or ever did, ordain*, and to call them so in this investigation can only lead to fallacy and confusion.

1. *Argument from the "Apostolical Constitutions."*

First, then, we find a note in these words—"The whole Episcopal controversy turns upon the *making*

of Presidents of the Primitive Church. It is a remarkable fact that while the Apostolical Constitutions enjoin the laying on of hands at the Ordination of Presbyters, this is omitted in the directions for the making of Bishops." Thus we are virtually asked to believe that the Episcopate is not a distinct Order of the Ministry because in the Primitive Church, according to this authority, it did not receive a distinct, complete, and substantive Ordination, like that given to Presbyters. It cannot be said that the witness is an unexceptionable one; nor, when we come to examine it, will the evidence which it gives be found either so plain or so conclusive as we are led to suppose. I scarcely need remind you that the compilation known by the name of "The Apostolical Constitutions," is a large and heterogeneous one, in eight books of very unequal value, of uncertain authorship, and no less uncertain date; that the first seven books are now commonly assigned to the end of the third or beginning of the fourth century; and that the eighth book, in which the passages alluded to by Dr Sprott are to be found, is probably to be placed a century later.[1] And what are the said passages![2] First, in chap. 16, we read:—"Concerning the Ordination of Presbyters, I, the beloved of the Lord (*i.e.*, St John), appoint to you, the Bishop, as follows: When thou ordainest a Presbyter, O Bishop, lay thy hand upon his head in thine own person" (αὐτὸς, *i.e.*, not delegating the office to another), "the Presbyters and

[1] See Dupin, "Eccl. Hist.," i., p. 30; Gieseler, "Ch. Hist.," i., 259; Dr Rainy, "Bible and Criticism," p. 95.

[2] (*a*) See "Constitut. Apostol." in Cotelerius' Patr. Apost., vol. i., p. 394 and p. 411, *seq.*

the Deacons standing by thee, and pray, saying," &c. Next, in the following chapter, we read—"Concerning the Ordination of Deacons, I, Philip, appoint thus :— Thou shalt make a Deacon, O Bishop, laying upon him thy hands, all the Presbyters standing by and the Deacons, and praying, thou shalt say : " &c. Whereas, what we read in chap. 4, concerning the Ordination of Bishops, is far more full than in the case of either of the other two Orders, beginning with these words—" I, Peter, say that the Bishop to be ordained "—χειροτονεῖσθαι, a word which of itself *may* imply the laying on of hands—[1] " is to be, as we have all of us together already appointed, unblameable in all things, . . . and when he has been named and approved, let the people assemble, with the Presbyters and Bishops that are present, on the Lord's Day, and let them give their consent." Then, after describing how the consent of the whole Assembly is to be three times publicly accorded in favour of the person selected, the writer proceeds :—" Silence being made, let one of the principal Bishops, together with two others, stand near the Altar, and while the rest of the Bishops and Presbyters pray silently, *and the Deacons hold the Divine Gospel open upon the head of him that is being ordained*, let him say to God thus ——," &c., &c. Now, surely the impression which this description conveys is not of an Ordination less solemn in comparison with the other two, but rather of *one more solemn ;* and whether hands were to be actually laid on or not (Dr Sprott assumes the negative, I think, rather too boldly), to me it appears that the action

[1] See Suicer Lex., s. v. 2.

of laying the open Bible, the Volume of Inspiration, upon the head of the ordained Bishop, is intended to represent something even higher and more sacred —a consecration to the Apostolic Office as if by the Spirit Himself, the Author of Holy Scripture, and in fancied imitation of our blessed Lord, when, in finally ordaining His Apostles, as the heads of His Church on earth, in His own stead, He did not, so far as we read, lay His hands upon them, but "He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost" (John xx. 22). But this is not all. I have said that Dr Sprott assumes rather too boldly that, according to this Apostolic Constitution, there was to be no laying on of hands in the Ordination of a Bishop. And my reason for saying so is this, viz., that among the Canons of the 4th Council of Carthage, held A.D. 398, which made a collection of 104 so called "Statuta Ecclesiæ Antiquæ," and which is said to have been attended by 214 African Bishops, including the great St Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, the second Statute or Canon runs thus :— "Episcopus cum Ordinatur, &c., when a Bishop is ordained, let two Bishops lay the Book of the Gospels upon his head and neck, and hold it there, and while one of the Bishops present pronounces the Blessing upon him, let all the other Bishops touch his head with their hands."[1] Palmer observes, "there is no evidence that the former practice has been generally prevalent from the most primitive ages, and therefore the Church of England has long been accustomed to present the Bible to the Prelate ordained, instead of laying it upon his shoulders."[2]

[1] Bruns. i. 141. [2] Orig. Liturg., ii. 302.

2. *Argument from "Popes and Councils," and from Foreign Reformers.*

But to pass on to the argument upon which Dr Sprott lays the greatest stress. It proceeds upon the fiction already suggested of two Orders in the Ministry, instead of three. That this is a fiction, and how the fiction arose, we shall see presently. We have already been told that "all the Reformed Churches held that there are only two Orders in the Ministry, of divine appointment," and now we are further informed that "one reason why these views were so prevalent at the Reformation was that they had generally been accepted in the Church before;" that is, in præ-reformed times. "Popes and Reforming Councils"—that is, I suppose, which had aimed at Reformation—"had alike committed themselves to the position that a Bishop is by Order no more than a Presbyter, and his pre-eminence is merely of Ecclesiastical, not of Divine, right." And it is added, "The question was purposely kept open by the Council of Trent, and the old view is still common in the Roman Catholic Church" (p. 189). Now what have we to say in reply to these statements? First, we remark; it was no easy matter to unravel all at once the Sophistical web, which, by the aid of the forged Decretals,[1] and of subservient Canonists and Schoolmen, Popery had woven, during the five or six preceding centuries — the object being to depress the Episcopal in order to elevate the Papal power.[2]

[1] See Dean Hook's Lives of Archbishops, vol. i. pp. 300-304.

[2] (*a*) See above, No. 2, p. 73; and No. 5, p. 240; also Canon Liddon's sermon, "A Father in Christ," p. 13. "The Papal representatives [at the Council of Trent] minimized the authority and rights of the Episcopate down to the verge of Presbyterianism."

With this object continually in view, it was a shrewd and clever device to minimize the Episcopate, so that it might become (to use Dr Sprott's expression) "a mere phase of Presbytery"—a device, for which no real sanction (beyond the well known, eccentric passages of Ambrosiaster and Jerome, towards the end of the fourth and in the early part of the fifth century), no genuine evidence of any Canon or Constitution whatever, not forged and spurious, can be found until we come to the middle and latter periods of the præ-reformed age. Then, indeed, we may find in abundance the "Popes and Councils," and Canonists, whom the Lutheran Church historian, Giesler, has brought together in a long note (vol. i., p. 89), which was probably in Dr Sprott's eye, ranging from about 1088 to 1563, and vying with each other to maintain "the original identity of Bishops and Presbyters," and the merely Ecclesiastical institution of the former. No wonder that after such proceedings for so long an interval, when the era of awakening fully arrived in the sixteenth century, it took some time, and required some more than common enlightenment to discover where the truth really lay. But, nevertheless, what are the facts which Dr Sprott has glossed over in the words which you have heard? First of all, the Council of Trent itself, mainly under the influence of the Spanish Bishops,[1] who manfully resisted the secret intrigues and the open dictation of the Papal partisans, passed a Canon in July 1563 (Sess. xxiii. 6) in these words: "Si quis dixerit, &c.—If any one shall say that there is not in the Catholic Church a Hierarchy,

[1] See Father Paul's Hist., pp. 552, 686.

instituted by Divine ordinance (Divinâ ordinatione institutam) which consists of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, let him be Anathema." Next, passing over to the Foreign Reformers, we remark that when they could not induce Rome to accept their terms; when, having no Reforming Bishops among them, they could not obtain Episcopal Ordination for their adherents without concessions which they thought it wrong to make; it was only natural they should have recourse to the figment of the sufficiency of Ordination by Presbyters which they had virtually learnt from the Pope themselves, and which by a most righteous *nemesis* was thus turned against its own authors. And yet even these Reformers, or at least the more learned, and the more dispassionate among them, such as Melancthon, could not prevail upon themselves to adopt this policy without much and repeatedly expressed misgiving; as appears, for instance, from the *ultimatum*, which they presented to the Elector of Wittenberg, in 1545, the year before Luther's death, and in which are these remarkable words: "Nothing seems more likely to promote harmony, than restoring to the Bishops Ordination, *which has always been accounted* their chief, or single function." [1]

3. *Argument from early Formularies and Divines of the Church of England.*

Next, as regards the Church of England; in order to prove "that the English Church was at that time of the same mind on this subject as the rest of the

[1] Seckendorf, "Hist. Luth.," ii. p. 538.

Reformed," Dr Sprott reminds us that "in the Book called 'The Institution of a Christian Man,' which was published in 1536, and approved by the Lords both Spiritual and Temporal, it is declared that there are only two Orders in the Ministry of Divine appointment, and that the pre-eminence of Bishops was of man" (p. 190). Be it so. The book referred to is one of the Three "Formularies of Faith put forth by Authority during the reign of King Henry VIII.,"—that is, at a time when the Church, though it had renounced the supremacy of the Pope two years before, viz., in 1534, mainly for reasons personal to the king, was still *unreformed*, and it was written therefore under the misleading influence which I have before explained; whereas, when we come to the actual period of Reformation, after King Henry's death, the true light was so far recovered, that in the Preface to the Ordinal, put forth in 1552, we meet with these wonderfully clear-sighted and never to-be-forgotten words—"It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and antient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these *Orders* of ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons;" that is (as plainly appears from what follows, and from the fact that each Order has a distinct formulary of Ordination), *not two Orders*, but *three;* and as "the Apostles' time" is spoken of, it is no less clearly to be inferred that each of the three is to be regarded not as a mere human or Ecclesiastical Ordinance, in the lower sense of the word, but as an Apostolic one. And therefore what Dr Sprott can mean when he goes on to tell his Theological Students, and his

readers in general, that "The English Ordinal contained *nothing* to distinguish the Order of Bishops from that of Presbyter between the Reformation and the time of Charles II., when it was amended"—that is, from 1552 to 1662—I am utterly at a loss to conceive; seeing that in the former year, 1552, it contained that Preface; and not that Preface only, but a complete Office, according to which a Bishop-elect was to receive a third, distinct, and certainly not less solemn Ordination (substantially the same in all respects as that we still use), with the laying-on of hands of the Archbishop and of the Bishops present. Nor is there any instance in the history of the Church of England of the exercise of Episcopal functions, including the power of Ordination, by one who had not been himself thus *thrice* ordained; however, between 1552 and 1662—in which latter year the Ordinal was slightly, as Dr Sprott truly says, "amended," the requirements of the Preface especially being worded somewhat more stringently, in order to exclude irregularities which had previously crept in—instances had sometimes occurred in which, as he also points out, Episcopal Ordination to the lower Orders, especially in the case of foreign Protestants, or residents on the Continent, had not been insisted on. Lastly, in regard to the sentiments of individual Divines, it is doubtless true that, at the first, several even of the most learned were not able (for the reason I have already given) to see their way, and were content to speak, as they had been taught by the Schoolmen, of only two "orders," though still of *three Degrees*. This was the case to some extent with Hooker, though not in

his latter books;[1] and also with Field, and Mason, and Forbes of Corse and Usher; all of whom, nevertheless, defend Episcopal authority and jurisdiction as of Divine appointment, at the same time that they speak of Bishops and Presbyters as of one Order. How this confusion (which, as I have said, cannot be traced back earlier than the 11th century, except in a few loosely dropt words of Ambrosiaster and Jerome) took its rise out of the scholastic definition of *Sacerdos*, viz., one authorised to consecrate the Holy Eucharist—an action common alike to Bishop and Presbyter—you may see fully explained by Bishop Andrews, Op. Posth. p. 182; by Bishop Pearson, Minor Works, Vol. i. pp. 275, 286, and comp. Memoir, p. lviii., and by Bingham, Antiq. Vol. i. p. 52, and Vol. ix. p. 245. I may also refer you to my own "Outlines of the Christian Ministry," p. 120, and to my "Remarks on Bishop Lightfoot's Essay," p. 59, a publication to which we must attribute, I fear, in part the recent revival of this mediæval fallacy.

And here I cannot refrain from pointing out that whatever may be the view of a Bishop of Durham in this 19th century upon the question before us, the venerable Bede, writing at Jarrow, in the same Diocese, in the early part of the 8th century, with all his knowledge of British Ecclesiastical History, Scotch and English, *knew nothing* of Bishops and Presbyters as constituting only one Order; knew nothing of Episcopacy as a "mere phase of Presbytery," or as an Ecclesiastical and not also a Divine Ordinance; as is plain from his commentary on St

[1] See E. P., Book v., c. 78, sections 2, 5, 9, 12, compared with Book vii., c. 6, sect. 1.

Luke x. 1, respecting the mission of the 70 or 72 Disciples — "Sicut Duodecim Apostolos formam Episcoporum exhibere simul et præmonstrare *nemo est qui dubitet*, sic et hos Septuagenta duos figuram Presbyterorum, *i.e.*, *secundi Ordinis Sacerdotum*, gessisse, *sciendum est;*"—a statement which you will do well to compare with Dr Sprott's remark, p. 192, that "the survival of some of the elements of the old Celtic Church had also a tendency in the direction of Presbytery. In the early Scottish and Irish Churches *the primitive and apostolic practice of consecrating all Presbyters Bishops* (!) seems to have prevailed longer than elsewhere." Such, it appears, is Dr Sprott's view. On the other hand, language of the same tenor as that of the venerable Bede, which I just now quoted, is to be found not only in all the Councils, as I said before, but in all the Fathers from the 8th century upwards—not even excepting St Jerome, if we take him as a whole. As to Canons and Councils, bearing on the threefold Ordination, and consequently the distinction of the three Orders, the testimony of the "Apostolical Canons" (older and more authentic than the "Constitutions") and of the first Œcumenical Council—the Council of Nicea—is alone sufficient. Among the former we read—"If any Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon receives from any one a Second Ordination," *i.e.*, in addition to that he has already received as such, "let him be deprived, and also the person who ordained him, unless he can show that his former Ordination was from Heretics" (c. 67 or 68). Of the 20 Nicene Canons there are not less than four (viz., 3, 15, 16, 18) which recognise distinctly the three

Orders. I will produce only two other testimonies. One is from the accurate and impartial, because unbelieving, historian, Gibbon. Describing the state of the Roman Empire under Constantine in the early part of the 4th century, he writes :—"The Catholic Church was administered by the spiritual and legal jurisdiction of 1800 Bishops, of whom one thousand were seated in the Greek, and eight hundred in the Latin Provinces of the Empire." And he adds, "The Bishops alone possessed the power of spiritual generation" (ch. xx.); meaning that the Ordination of Clergy was confined exclusively to them. The other testimony is from the judicious Hooker:—"No one is able to show either Deacon or Presbyter ordained by Presbyters, and his Ordination accounted lawful in any ancient part of the Church."[1] It is simply impossible that facts such as are thus vouched for, should ever have come into existence, if there were any truth in Dr Sprott's contention that there are only two Orders of Divine appointment in the Church, and that the Episcopate is not one of them. Nor again is it conceivable that the Ignatian Epistles could have been written—and I may remind you that even Bishop Lightfoot has now ceased to entertain any doubts concerning their genuineness—if we accept Dr Sprott's notion.[2] These Epistles, as you

[1] Book vii., c. 6, sect. 5.

[2] (*a*) Dr Milligan, in his St Giles' Lecture, 1883, reproduced a part of Dr Sprott's argument, without noticing my refutation of it, which probably he had not seen. Dr Cunningham, in his Croall Lecture, 1886, has done the same; and strange to say, has at the same time made a reference to Dr Sprott and "also to Bishop Wordsworth" (p. 68 note), as if we had both taken the same side of the question. But Dr C. goes further. He fancies that he sees in the Presbyterian

will know, are full *not of a twofold*, but *of the threefold Ministry;* so that whatever may have been the case in the time of Knox, and of Melville, and even of Henderson—when the cloud which hung over the authenticity of the Ignatian Epistles had not yet been dispersed—it is now no longer possible for Scholars to deny that the Ministry of three Orders is of primitive origin, and to be traced directly to the Apostles themselves.

Importance of the Question now discussed.

My apology for entering once more into all this argument, and thereby occupying so large a portion of your time, is this: I am thoroughly determined that, so far as I can prevent it, the scandal and disgrace of the divisions at present existing between so-called Christian Churches in this country, shall not, with any semblance of justice or of truth, be laid at our door. And this is what the teaching of Dr Sprott (though he himself may have no wish to press us with the conclusion, and writes only in self-defence) really tends to. If he can prove that Episcopacy is not a necessary Order, derived from the

platform of Ministers, Lay Elders, and Deacons an exact facsimile of the Threefold Ministry of Bishop, Priests, and Deacons of the Ignatian Epistles (p. 66 and p. 73). It is quite true, as he observes (quoting Dr Hatch), that many of the Primitive Dioceses, especially in Asia Minor and North Africa, were very small—not larger than a large-sized parish in parts of Scotland or England—but their Episcopal organisation was no less real and complete than that of the most extensive. It does not appear that Lay Eldership had any existence; and the Presbyters were Clergy occupying a grade subordinate to that of the Bishop, and superior to that of the Deacons.

Apostles, and intended to be continued in the Catholic Church, then the Presbyterian Establishment, being confessedly an "ordinance of man," and as such claiming our "submission" by the Word of God,[1] I do not hesitate to say I am prepared at once to join that Establishment, and to recommend you all, both clergy and laity, to do the same; and so, without more ado, to let our disunion cease. But if Episcopacy be an ordinance, not of man only, but of God — an ordinance forming an essential element, with a view to the permanent organisation, and consequent unity, of the Christian body—then we have no alternative but to adhere to it. That is our position. At the same time be it well observed, I have not said—nor do I mean to say—that there is no good in Presbyterian Ordination (however irregular according to the strict law of the Church); or that, claiming an Apostolic descent (as it does, according to Dr Sprott's view), it is not better than a system which derives its ministerial authority, not from above, but from below; not from the perpetual gift of our Lord, as Head of the Church, to His Apostles, but from the power supposed to be inherent in the body at large. But what I do say is, that the attempt to get rid of the three Orders of the Ministry by reducing them to two, and so far to imitate the policy of the Church of Rome—which, though it has in all not less than seven Orders in its Ministry, does not reckon the Episcopate as one of them,[2] and thus incurs the anathema of its own Tridentine Council, declared three years

[1] 1 Peter ii. 13; Rom. xiii. 1, 2.

[2] See "Cat. Rom.," first published 1566, Part 2, cap. vii. 12.

before [1]—such an attempt will never satisfy any learned or candid enquirer who desires to look impartially into the facts of the case.

Danger from Tampering with Catholic Tradition.

But further, I must not fail to warn you, as I would also venture, with all due respect, to impress upon Dr Sprott, that, if we are to depart from the records of the earlier Church, and to trust ourselves to mediæval depravations, there is much to be said, upon grounds of Scripture, in favour of the theory of Congregationalism or Independency—in other words, of a system of Ordination and of Church government, which is derived, not from above, but from below. It is right, especially in those days, when even the distinction between Clergy and Laity is liable to be called in question, that your attention should be drawn to the fact that, notwithstanding we are wont to boast of the increased study given to Holy Scripture, and the improved processes of interpretation that are now applied to it, we are still exposed to doubt upon many of the most important texts; and among these, upon that great text, with which St Matthew concludes his Gospel (xxviii. 16-20, comp. Mark xvi. 14-16): "Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in

[1] This, I suppose, is what Dr Sprott alludes to when he says that "this question," *i.e.*, of the distinct order of the Episcopate, "was purposely kept open by the Council of Trent," the *Catechism* being put forth "*ex decreto* Concilii Tridentini," tho' "jussu Pii v. Pont. Max." This is a new way of keeping a question "open"—to assert it in one document, and deny it in another!

heaven and in earth; go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptising them," &c.,&c. We are accustomed to regard those words as addressed by our Lord only to the eleven Apostles, and as containing the "fundamental charter" of our clerical commission; and as such they are appealed to in the Introduction to our Scottish Code of Canons (p. x.), and our Anglican Ordinal reads them as an alternative Gospel in the consecration of Bishops. But in controversy, at least, it will be no longer prudent to assume this. There are many commentators, and some even of our own divines, who harmonise the appearance of our Lord there spoken of with that which He made to the "five hundred brethren at once" (1 Cor. xv. 6). It will not surprise you perhaps, that the latter view appears to be favoured by Bishop Lightfoot.[1] But the same is adopted in the "Speaker's Commentary." And Bishop Ellicott, in his "Historical Lectures,"[2] plainly states that "nearly all the best recent expositors concur in supposing that the appearance of our Lord mentioned by St Matthew xxviii. 16 is identical with that alluded to by St Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 6." And it is in accordance with this view, pushed to its full extreme, that in the last publication of the late Dean Stanley—his "Christian Institutions"—we read the following words, which are quoted with apparent approval in the *Edinburgh Review* of October last [1881], p. 321:—"In the first beginning of Christianity there was no such institution as the Clergy; and it is conceivable that there may be a time when they shall cease to be." Happily, on the

[1] Essay, p. 267, comp. 257 and my Remarks, p. 18.
[2] See p. 411, note, 5th edit.

other side, as regarding those solemn words of our Lord in the light of a commission to the Apostles and to their successors, "even unto the end of the world," we have living[1] theologians, such as the Bishop of Salisbury,[2] and the Bishop of Lincoln[3] and the Bishop of Edinburgh,[4] together with one who stands at the very head of modern commentators in Germany—I mean Dr Meyer, in whose judgment the other interpretation is "purely arbitrary."[5] It is not, then, to be doubted that the Gospel prescribes a Ministry—a *bona-fide* Clerical Ministry—and one which (as we and Presbyterians, or at least, I suppose, the greater part of them, are agreed) derives its sanction, not from below, but from above. But in regard to the characteristics and conditions of this Ministry, so long as we and Presbyterians are not agreed, not only must obedience to the Divine command of Unity be explained away, or rather cast, as it were, to the winds, but we must expect to see, as we do see, irregular agencies (always uncertain in their work, and exposed to great temptations) stepping in to perform our common duty, and to challenge the respect and attention which we, by our divisions, have done so much to forfeit.

In the meantime, nothing is to be gained, and much may be lost, by attempting to precipitate measures, which if they are to heal effectually disorders of so complicated a nature and such long-

[1] All three are now [1886] dead. Canon Liddon may be added as a witness on the same side. See his sermon, "A Father in God," 1885, p. 9. Tertullian also confines the commission to the Eleven, "De Præscript. Hœret.," c. 20.

[2] See his "Great Forty Days," p. 46, *seq.*

[3] In loc.

[4] "Sermon on Unity," 1879, p. 6.

[5] In loc.

continuance, must themselves be the growth of much prolonged and cautious deliberation. And I do not hesitate to add that the best contribution which we ourselves can severally make towards the attainment of the desired end, is, first, by earnest and persevering prayer to the Giver of all good to bestow upon us the great blessing which we now lack; and next, by endeavouring to increase, through all legitimate means, our own personal influence in our respective spheres. And how is this latter object—the gaining and extending of personal influence—to be accomplished? It is little to say, that we must abstain from all conscious insubordination among ourselves, and from all arrogant or uncharitable language and behaviour towards our Presbyterian brethren of every degree. Much more than this is required of every one of us. It must be seen that, as Clergy, you are devoted, not by constraint, but heartily, to all the duties of your sacred office; your constant public and domestic worship, your diligent and carefully studied and prepared preaching, your punctual and affectionate ministrations to the sick within your charge, your utter renunciation of all undue worldliness in your daily walk and conversation—these must be seen and read of all men. Further, it must be seen that you understand the true nature of the office into which you have been admitted, and that you value it at its real worth; otherwise it is hopeless to expect that your duties will be performed in the proper spirit, or that the performance itself will reach to that elevation, or be supported by the self-sacrifice, which the Scripture teaches and demands. Looking to our

Church at large, it may be that there are to be found among our Clergy tendencies or indications sufficient to give occasion for the taunt which is sometimes brought against us—of sacerdotalism. Into the nicer questions which that word may raise, I have little inclination, and the time forbids me now, to enter. Only let me say, if it be sacerdotalism to expect and believe that to those whom He has called by His Spirit to the holy ministry of His Church, God will give the necessary grace and power[1] to enable them to discharge the momentous functions of the ministry for the salvation of souls in a way beyond what He gives to others who are not so called and ordained[2]—if this be sacerdotalism, then I trust we are all sacerdotalists. But if it means that we hold ourselves entitled to be lords over the faith of our lay brethren, or to abridge the full liberty that they have, no less than ourselves, in the Gospel of Jesus Christ, or to exclude them from their due share in the Conciliar action of the Church, then I hope we have no part in it. So long as we work in this spirit and upon these principles, we have undoubtedly much to encourage us. On the one hand, with the balance of Scripture evidence,

[1] See 2 Tim. i. 6.

[2] Having before referred to the remarkable discussion which took place in this year's General Assembly, on the subject of Ordination—a discussion followed by a Resolution, which appears to compromise the position of the Established Church in regard to that important matter—I am glad to call attention to a Sermon of Principal Tulloch, preached before the General Assembly in 1879 on "The Ideal of the Church," in which he spoke of "the Divine *charisma* imparted to Timothy by his Ordination to the Christian Ministry," and described that *charisma* or gift as "the special qualification of Timothy for his high office of Pastor and Bishop in the Church." P. 3.

if intelligently weighed, and with the whole tenor of early ecclesiastical history, if truthfully represented, in our favour; and, on the other hand, with the greater part of the landed proprietary, and a very large share of the cultured intelligence, of the country on our side; we may well feel confidence in our position, notwithstanding that our present numbers include so small a portion of the general population; — a fact, however, which is fully accounted for by reasons entirely extrinsical to the truth of our cause, and which, consequently, *in foro conscientiæ* can be regarded as of little or no weight.[1] And, entertaining and cherishing this legitimate confidence, we shall feel no grudge—rather we shall cordially rejoice — at the recovered strength and increased energy of our brethren of the Established Church, thanking God for their good works, and praying that, until it shall please Him to reconcile and re-unite us again into one body, the only contention, the only provocation and rivalry, seen between us may be, which shall be foremost in the pursuit of all things true, honourable, just, pure, lovely, and of good report; which shall show to the other with greater constancy and alacrity the "more excellent way." Acting thus, we shall at least be contributing our own share towards recovering the Unity for which our Redeemer prayed, in order that the world might believe that God had sent Him (John xvii. 21).

[1] See Appendix in next number, chapter I.

The following are the Subjects of this Series as already published:—

NUMBER I.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION.

NUMBER II.

OUR CHIEF DANGER AS A NATION: Its Cause and Remedy.

NUMBER III.

UNITY A DIVINE LAW OF UNIVERSAL OBLIGATION.

NUMBER IV.

PROVISION FOR OBSERVANCE OF LAW OF UNITY.

NUMBER V.

THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION IMPARTIALLY EXAMINED.

NUMBER VI.

REUNION OF THE CHURCH IN GREAT BRITAIN.

NUMBER VII.

PLEA FOR UNIFORMITY IN MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH.

NUMBER VIII.

RESPONSE OF EPISCOPALIANS TO MODERATOR'S APPEAL.

NUMBER IX.

THE MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

NUMBER X.

EUODIAS AND SYNTYCHE; OR THE SCOTTISH CHURCH IN ITS RELATIONS, PAST AND PRESENT, TO THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

NUMBER XI.

PROSPECTS OF RECONCILIATION BETWEEN PRESBYTERY AND EPISCOPACY.

INTRODUCTION.

IT has never been my aim, nor indeed my wish, in making these "Appeals," to attempt to stir up those to whom they have been addressed, and who may feel an interest in their proposed object, to any hasty or immediate course of action. I have not so miscalculated the greatness of the undertaking, nor the nature and extent of the difficulties to be overcome, as to imagine that the national prejudice against a recurrence to Episcopacy in any shape—deeply-rooted as that prejudice is in the history of the past—would disappear otherwise than by slow degrees under any force of argument however unanswerable, or any discovery of the truth however clear. It was enough if I might be permitted to obtain a hearing, and (like the old man[1] of whom the elder Statius sings:—"Serit arbores, quæ alteri sæculo prosint") to sow the seed, which in course of time, under favourable circumstances, and with God's blessing, might spring up and grow, and eventually bring forth its proper fruit. Early in the day I had recourse several times to Public Lectures in advocating the cause; but I have never thought that the matter was one which could be wisely or beneficially dealt with in public meetings and speeches on a Platform, or even (except on very rare and special occasions) from the Pulpit. I have therefore pre-

[1] See Cic., "De Senectute," c. 7.

ferred to confine myself to such attempts as I could make through Addresses at our annual Diocesan Synods, through frequent letters in the newspapers, and generally through the press.[1]

And now, if I am asked whether the "Prospects of Reconciliation," which in 1882 formed the main subject of my Synodal Address (reprinted in the last number of these "Appeals"), have become brighter *in any material respect* since that time, my answer must be—I can scarcely tell. On the one hand there have been encouraging signs; on the other hand there have been signs which could not fail to produce the contrary effect: and the two, taken together, may be said perhaps to indicate *some degree of progress*, but of progress slow and almost imperceptible. Among the former—the signs of *encouragement*—the following deserve particular mention: (1.) The lecture by Dr Cunningham on Dr Robert Lee in the third St Giles' series, 1882-3, in the course of which, with reference to the subject of my previous Charge, he was so good as to say (p. 408), "We pray *such prospects* may become brighter and brighter every day." (2.) The generous monograph on Bishop Ewing among "Scottish Divines" by Dr Cameron Lees in the same series of St Giles' Lectures. (3.) The Letter on "Church Union" by

[1] This last has been done, more particularly in my "Outlines of the Christian Ministry," 1872; in my "Remarks on Bishop Lightfoot's Essay," 1879; second edition, 1884; in two Articles in *The Nineteenth Century*, March and May 1878; in "A Discourse on Scottish Church History," 1881; in an article, "Union or Separation?" in *The Scottish Church Review*, May 1884, subsequently published in pamphlet form (see below, p. 678); and in "A Contribution to the Seabury Commemoration," 1884.

Dr Milligan in *The Catholic Presbyterian* for September 1883. (4.) The Sermon entitled "The Body of Christ," by the Rev. John Parker, minister of Cleland, June 8, 1884, in the Preface of which he writes: "It is not too much to say that the reunion for which Dr Milligan pleaded is the ideal of some of the best men of the Church at the present time, which means that, in spite of bigotry and narrow prejudice, it is *on the slow but sure way to triumphant fulfilment.* English Puritanism has done and is doing much to narrow the Creed, vulgarise the Worship, and embitter the religious life of Scotland; but thoughtful Churchmen are looking to the communion, of which Bishop Wordsworth is so distinguished a representative, for other and better influences." (5.) The Sermon of the Rev. James Cooper of Aberdeen, February 21, 1886, advocating, like Mr Parker, the "Reconstruction of the Scottish Church" on a broader basis than that of mere Presbyterianism. And I may add (6.) the invitation which I myself received from the Principal and Professors of the University of Aberdeen to deliver an Address to the students, which accordingly I did on the evening of that same day. This last may appear to imply somewhat of a *general* sentiment among the members of that academical body in a favourable direction;[1] but otherwise it will be seen

[1] The same may be said of the invitation which I received from students of "all denominations," who form the Missionary Association at St Andrews, in the spring of 1884, to preach their annual sermon for that year in the parish church; which I did (with the full approval of the University authorities, and of both the ministers of the same church) under circumstances which I thought it desirable to explain in a letter addressed to the Dean of my Diocese, and published

that the tokens of encouragement which I have quoted go no further than to prove a certain amount of *individual* sympathy, and all proceeding from members of the Established Church. From the Free Church there has appeared, so far as I am aware, no sign at all, friendly or the reverse, unless I am to claim the kindly judgment which the late Dr Begg expressed on a public occasion in favour of my discourse (1881) "on Scottish Church History." On the other hand, the *discouraging* signs have been, for the most part, not so much personal as of a general and collective character. First and most important, in the proceedings of the General Assembly there has been little or nothing since 1882 to afford us even a ray of hope. This was strikingly the case in the Assembly of 1884, when the Overture on Union came up from the Presbyterian Synod of Aberdeen; so much so that I felt it my duty to draw attention to it in my Synodal Address for that year; and I think it desirable to reproduce at length what I then said:—

"I regret to say that we cannot congratulate the Assembly upon the measure to which it had recourse in order to get rid of that overture. The resolution which it passed by an overwhelming majority was not worthy of it. It showed little or nothing of the enlarged sympathy—little or nothing of the enlightened intelligence which at the present day the Scottish nation has a right to expect from the representative wisdom of its Established Church. It showed no capacity to look forward to a future better than the present, with which no Christian man can be satisfied; but it went back to the past—to 1878—and it was content to take its stand upon ground

at the time. Concerning the circumstances under which I have preached annually in the last three sessions at the College Church, see Introduction to No. 11, p. 614.

which all who voted for it must have known to be utterly unsubstantial, utterly unreal now, whatever it may have been six years ago. Let me quote the words to which I more particularly refer :—'The General Assembly renew the expression of their hearty willingness and desire to take all possible steps, consistent with the maintenance and support of an Establishment of religion, to promote co-operation in good works, and the reunion of *Churches which adhere to the same Confession of Faith.* They renew their injunction to ministers to cultivate in their work the spirit of Unity, and the habit of co-operation with the ministers *of all the Evangelical Churches.*' Now, I call the ground thus taken up utterly unreal, upon two accounts. First, 'the same Confession of Faith' means, I suppose, the Westminster Confession. Is it not, then, notorious that the national conscience is becoming yearly less and less satisfied to accept that Confession as a true exponent of its faith upon several important points? that it regards it as a snare and a bondage of which the lovers of religious truth are becoming more and more impatient? To give but one example. I remember an able and interesting lecture, delivered by Dr Cunningham, of Crieff, in January 1877, 'On the Westminster Assembly and its Work,' in which, among other serious blemishes which he points out in the Confession, he speaks of a clause in the 3d chapter as one which 'it is impossible (even) to read without a shudder.' But more than this. Is it not a fact that since 1878 both the United Presbyterian Church and the Free Church have felt themselves constrained to relax the obligations they had previously imposed : the former by the 'Declaratory Act,' adopted in May 1879 ; and the latter by the altered formula to be subscribed by deacons, from which all reference to the Confession of Faith is now omitted, and which was accepted by the General Assembly of the Free Church this very year, May 27, just four days before the General Assembly of the Established Church reasserted the reactionary resolution of which I speak? I call it 'reactionary,' both on other accounts and because in the General Assembly of the year before last the closing address of the Moderator—Dr Milligan—and a remarkable speech of Principal Tulloch, an ex-Moderator,

distinctly indicated that, in their opinion, in any future consideration of the great question of the reunion of Churches, the case of the Episcopal Church ought no longer to be kept out of view. But now it would seem that *our existence is to be again ignored;* and, consequently, that the unanswerable argument by which Dr Milligan so justly urged the importance of endeavouring to bring our landed proprietors into Christian communion with their tenants and dependents, is to be set at nought. I say that by those words of the resolution to which I am referring, our existence is ignored. For although there was a time—the period of our second re-establishment, 1660-1690—during which some of the Bishops were content, for peace' sake, to tolerate the formularies of the Westminster Assembly[1]—and some of our Clergy after the Revolution consented to subscribe the Confession as a condition of being permitted to retain their benefices—although this was so, it must be well known that now there is not one of us who would not refuse to accept that Confession out of regard for what is due, not only to his own convictions, but to the progressive thought and intelligence of Presbyterians themselves.[2] I am the more justified in saying this by what has taken place since the meeting of the General Assembly at the Pan-Presbyterian Council held three months ago at Belfast. A numerous and vigorous Presbyterian body of recent origin in Central America, known as 'The Cumberland Church,' was formally received into the alliance, notwithstanding the 'very large changes' or 'modifications' which it has insisted upon making in the Westminster Confession.

"But I pass on to the other account which induced me to speak of the resolution in question as based upon ground which is unsubstantial. It confines its expressed desire for 'a habit of co-operation' to 'the ministers of all the Evangelical Churches.' Can any person tell what that expression means? The term is one which has obtained a footing on the Continent to designate a section of the divided Church of original Protestants; but, so far as I am aware, it is unknown to all sound theology, and carries with it no clearly defined or intelligible

[1] See Grub's Hist., iii., 217; Taylor Innes's "Law of Creeds," p. 68.

[2] See above, No. 11, p. 620.

signification. We use it, indeed, in speaking of 'Evangelical truth,' as we speak of 'Scriptural doctrine;' but otherwise it is not recognised in any of the Anglican standards, nor in our current speech, except to indicate a somewhat narrow partisanship; and whether as the General Assembly used it, it is intended to include our Church, or to include one portion of it and exclude another, no one, I suppose, even of those who voted for the resolution, could plainly tell. Again, therefore, I must repeat that to deal in this manner with a matter so solemn—so personally and socially important—as the existence of our unhappy divisions, was not worthy of that great body which, as it is certainly the most highly favoured, so it claims to represent in the most favourable light the religion of this Christian land. Nor can it be said that the discussion upon the overture, with the exception of Dr Milligan's speech, did justice to the character and ability of those who took the leading part in persuading the Assembly to dispose of the matter as they did. The minority which supported Dr Milligan was very small, and would be to us very disheartening, if it were not, as I believe, no real indication, so far as we are concerned, of the actual sentiments which exist in the minds of a large proportion of the most influential Presbyterians, both Ministers and Elders, in regard to the desirability of union between us and them. The real impediment lies, not in their convictions or feelings towards us, or towards our cause, but in the unhappy, and, I venture to say, the unjustifiable stringency of their Ordination formula, which must make them only too conscious that they are not free fairly to discuss with us the terms upon which, under the guidance of Scripture and of the principles and practice of the Primitive Church, the differences which separate us may be reconciled and adjusted. This is a subject which must be kept in view, though I forbear to discuss it fully now.[1] Suffice it to say, for the present, that the policy represented by the resolution of which I have been speaking is little calculated, in my opinion, to strengthen the position of the Established Church. To take the narrowest view; considering the line which most of the members of our Church

[1] See above, Introduction to No. 4, pp. 161-65.

have followed *in opposing disestablishment* — and this, notwithstanding the universally acknowledged probability that disestablishment would add very largely to our numbers—I think we deserved other treatment. But I would rather argue the matter upon higher ground. An Established Church in a Christian land is only defensible when it honestly endeavours to embrace all who are willing to belong to it upon Scriptural terms. We ourselves, and especially our great landed proprietors, for obvious reasons of their own, over and above the general obligation which we all feel to avoid divisions, are willing and anxious to belong to the Established Church of this country upon such terms. But *such terms are not offered us.* The Ordination formula, to which I just now referred, is alone a sufficient proof of this. That they who first imposed it, nearly two centuries ago—for it was unknown in the times of Knox, of Melville, and even of Henderson—that the first imposers of it for the most part assented to it cordially, that they believed it to be fully justified by the testimony of Holy Scripture, as they understood it, I have little doubt. But the question is whether Presbyterians themselves at the present day have the same belief; whether they do not feel, in their secret hearts, that what satisfied their fathers two centuries ago *does not satisfy them?*[1] They know, or may easily ascertain, first, that there is no instance, or indication, of Ordination of Presbyters alone in the New Testament; and next, they must be aware that to assert that a system of parity in the Christian ministry is 'founded upon the Word of God and agreeable thereto' is equivalent to asserting that *the primitive undivided Church, both in the East and in the West,* which never recognised such a system, *either did not understand the teaching of Scripture upon so important a point, or did not care to adhere to it*—a monstrous proposition, which no man of a humble, no man of a candid or well-instructed mind would venture to maintain. That young men who are candidates for a position in life, or laymen who are anxious to do good, but have paid little attention to matters of controversy—that such persons should be found to

[1] See Dr R. Wallace, quoted in No. 11, p. 620, and the note in next page.

make the promise involved in subscription to that formula, is perhaps, under all the circumstances, however much to be regretted, not much to be wondered at; but that Ministers of the Gospel, of mature age and experience, of sound judgment, of unquestionable learning, and of the highest Christian character, should be found, in this latter part of the nineteenth century, to persist in requiring the promise to be made as a condition of Ordination—without any effort to extricate themselves from such a predicament—is to me, I must confess, *very astonishing*, and, I must add, *very melancholy*."

The foregoing remarks elicited a full and not unfriendly commentary from my friend, Dr Cunningham, in a Sermon or Lecture reported at the time in a Crieff newspaper, in the course of which he so far recognised the justice of my objection to the terms of the Presbyterian Ordination formula as to say, "he thought they might be less stringent!"[1] I hope he will one day say the same in the General Assembly. Nay, I hope he will one day apply to his own Brethren in that Assembly the language which, as Moderator, in his closing Address a few weeks ago, he used in reference to the Free Church:—"I am surprised," he said, "at the attitude taken up by the majority of the Free Church Clergy. There would be nothing strange or blameworthy if they would openly confess that they had changed their minds; that they had found it *expedient to shift the ground on which they first took their stand*. . . .

[1] Dr Robert Lee was of the same opinion; and, moreover, "he questioned the power of the Assembly to make the entrance to the Church narrower than Parliament had made it." See Dr Cunningham's St Giles' Lecture, third series, p. 418. Nevertheless, this was done by the General Assembly in 1711. See above, Introduction to No. 4, p. 163.

How wonderful the elasticity of clerical consciences *under the strain of compulsory subscription!*" But an unknown writer of a letter in *The Scotsman*, signing himself "A Parish Minister," was still more kind and friendly than Dr Cunningham had been. Referring to my recent Charge, he did his best to assure me that I had no real occasion to be *discouraged;* that, however "the deliverance of the last Assembly might *appear* unfavourable, my unwearied efforts to promote the cause of reunion had secured for me the respect and affection of *a large section of the National Church;*" and that "I should be wrong in taking the deliverance of the Assembly as a matter of practical importance;" adding, "The leaders of the Church are still, to a considerable extent, under the influence of the Disestablishment scare;" which, he intimates, had gone far to prevent any display of the more catholic sympathies, which, nevertheless, were really and widely felt.

But the sentiments of that letter are so important, that, coming, as they appear to do, from a person not only of manifest intelligence, but of some authority, I proceed to quote them at greater length; to our own people, who feel that they have had some reason to be dispirited, they may serve to give greater courage and interest in the cause, to which it would wrong them to suppose that, either as Christians or as Patriots, they can be indifferent:—

"Dr Wordsworth is not alone in his conviction that the Episcopal Church in Scotland has, to say the least, a deeper root in the national history and life than some of the recent sects whose fellowship we are enjoined to cultivate, and whose Ministers have been admitted with fatal facility to benefices in the National Church:"—

words which, if applicable then, are now still more so, in consequence of the new Resolution to that effect adopted by the Assembly for the present year.

Afterwards, in reference to the stringency of the Ordination formula, the same "Parish Minister" writes as follows:—

"I think, too, that the learned Prelate puts a much more rigid interpretation upon our Ordination vow than it bears in our own minds, or in the mind of the Church which imposes it. Some of our most eminent Divines have declared that they are Presbyterians simply on the ground of expediency. Dr MacGregor, in the St Giles' Lectures, first series, says (p. 363):—'The system, so theoretically perfect, is not without grave practical defects. There is a want of central control, a want of *the unity, concentration, and cohesiveness which Diocesan Episcopacy gives.*' . . . The Bishop may therefore, in the face of utterances like these, coming from the most prominent of our Divines, believe that the Church interprets in a most liberal spirit the Ordination vow of which he is so much afraid.[1] If an Overture on Reunion comes up before the Assembly next year, the Mover and Seconder will not feel that they are acting in opposition to the spirit of their vow. As long as Presbyterianism, pure and simple, is the government of the Church, they will abide by it. But that will not hinder them from asking the Church *to modify a system* which none of us believe to be infallible. If our Dissenting Brethren are allowed to modify in the direction of Independency without reproach, surely we may modify in a larger, a more liberal, and a more national direction. Bishop Wordsworth has only to examine the Book of Order, and our Hymnal and Anthem book, or to witness the mode in which our services are conducted and the Sacraments dispensed; or to listen to our teaching from Sabbath to Sabbath; or, better still, to come into personal and living contact with a large proportion of our Clergy and Laity, and he will feel that *the heart of the Church*

[1] But compare the words of "A. K. H. B.," quoted in Introduction to No. 4, p. 164; and of "A Parish Minister," in No. 7, p. 384.

is with him.[1] There is a growing party—a party by no means to be overlooked—which holds that while our Episcopalian friends have something to learn from us" [this I myself have said again and again], "we can also learn something from them. The Free Church and the United Presbyterian Church are doing their best to make the reconstruction of the National Church impossible; and even if a temporary union were struck up, they would bring elements into the Church which would soon rend it again. In a union with our Episcopalian Brethren *we should gain exactly the element the want of which is a source of difficulty to Established, and of gradual disintegration to non-Established Presbyterianism.* I may add that some of the most eminent Presbyterian Divines in America hold similar opinions, and boldly urge the adoption of a Modified Episcopacy as the only means of preserving their Church from disintegration and decay."

O SI SIC OMNIA! The representation may be—and I heartily hope it is—all true and trustworthy; but, unhappily, it is *anonymous.* Moreover, since it was written two General Assemblies have been held, and, unhappily again, with *similar*, that is, *discouraging, results.* And this has been felt by us as the more disappointing because in the spring of 1884, I had put forth an Article (afterwards published as a Pamphlet[2]) in *The Scottish Church Review*, on "Union or Separation?" in which I had indicated more distinctly than on any former occasion the terms on

[1] This was denied by "R. H. S." in a short answer to the "Parish Minister's" letter.

[2] That Pamphlet has not been included in this series because it received at the time such an extensive circulation through the kind assistance, partly of an unknown Benefactor who directed the Publishers to send out at his expense 2000 copies to so many Presbyterian Ministers of the E.C. and F.C.; and partly of Lord Nelson, President of the Home Reunion Society in England, by whom 500 copies were ordered for distribution among its members.

which I thought a union between ourselves and Presbyterians might be gradually effected ;[1] and also because, in the Autumn of that year, two of our Diocesan Synods—Aberdeen and St Andrews—had passed Resolutions (the former by a great majority, the latter unanimously) in favour of such a union.

But it has not been only in the General Assembly that our cause has appeared to be making little or no way. In the Anti-Disestablishment agitation during the last winter, although we were freely canvassed to sign petitions, and applied to for help in other ways, in behalf of the Established Church, I do not remember any instance in which the support which many of us had rendered was publicly acknowledged; whereas I do remember only too well that in the largest meeting held, and in the most important speech delivered during that critical time, the foremost Layman of the Established Church went out of his way to attack Episcopacy and Episcopalians (without incurring any syllable of remonstrance either at the time or afterwards) although, together with the Leaders, Lay and Clerical, of the Establishment, there were also well-known Episcopalians present on the same platform, who had come to show their sympathy, and to give their moral weight to the cause which the meeting was held to advocate.[2] How keenly this treatment was felt by many of our members, both Clerical and Lay, I had good reason to know from communications which I received,

[1] They were substantially the same as those stated in my letter to Mr James Hannay, Sept. 16, 1863. See above, Postscript to No. 7, p. 387. Also the letter of a Bombay Chaplain, *Ibid.* p. 386.

[2] Speech of Duke of Argyll at Glasgow, Oct. 20, 1885.

thanking me for a letter which I felt it my duty to write to *The Scotsman*, Oct. 21, 1885, in order to show that the remarks complained of were, in the present posture of ecclesiastical affairs, no less mischievous and impolitic than they were uncharitable and unjust.

I may now pass on to say a few words in reference to my Synodal Address of last year, which is reprinted in the following pages; and which, while it closes the series of these "Appeals," will serve, I hope, to show that, whether encouraged or discouraged, I have all along desired to meet our Presbyterian Brethren as far as I could, and to take the most favourable view of their position.

I was fully aware that the main argument of that Address was not likely to prove acceptable to some at least of the straiter and more rigid members of our own body. And perhaps I was less careful than I ought to have been in stating the precise point which I undertook to maintain. In the first place I do not maintain that *all* Non-Episcopal Ordination is valid. It may be not only schismatical but heretical. In the next place I was concerned only with Presbyterianism which is not heretical, but orthodox; and with Presbyterianism which has a History to show of struggles against despotism, of hardships and persecution, which provoke our repugnance against those who inflicted rather than against those who suffered them. Fitted to that History my argument is only an extension of the ground taken up by the great English Divines when they held that the Non-Episcopal Ordination of the Foreign Protestants was justifiable and valid under the treatment which they received from the Church

of Rome and from their own Bishops who adhered to that Church; or rather (considering the deep and mysterious character of the whole subject) the view which I wished to take was not so much to *assert the positive* side of the argument, except as probable, and under all the circumstances, fully admissible, but to *repudiate the negative*, viz., that our Presbyterian Ministers, as regards their Ordination, are no better than Laymen. And this I think is the attitude towards the question taken by our own, *i.e.*, the Anglican, Church; and taken also by the Primitive Church. As a general rule, our Church, in her own practice, will have nothing to say to non-Episcopal orders,[1] because she holds them to be *irregular;* but she does *not* pronounce them to be *invalid;* and whoever does so pronounce of them must do it upon his own responsibility;[2] her own testimony being upon the whole (according to my judgment) in favor of their validity in cases where there is no conscious departure from the Catholic Faith.[3] And such, I believe is also the main drift of the testimony of the

[1] Such has been the rule laid down in the Preface to the Ordinal since the last Review, 1661-2. Compare below, p. 702, and see my "Outlines of the Christian Ministry," p. 222, note.

[2] See above, Introduction to No. 11, p. 606, and below, p. 702, and compare "Outlines of the Christian Ministry," p. 226.

[3] See, *e.g.*, the late Archdeacon Grant's "Bampton Lectures" (1843), p. 13, note. "By far the ablest Protestant Missionaries *in connection with the Church of England* have throughout been not Germans only but *Lutherans*. . . . In 1842 the number of Lutheran Ministers on the list of the Church Missionary Society amounted to twelve." There can be no doubt that in Scotland at the Restoration (1661-2) a large proportion of the clergy who had not received Episcopal Ordination were allowed to retain their Benefices upon no other condition than that of acknowledging the authority of the Bishop of the Diocese. See Grub's "History," vol. iii., p. 205; Burnet's "Own Time," vol. i., p. 252; also *Ibid.*, vol. v., p. 108.

Primitive Church. Take, for instance, the following passage of St Augustine in his Tract "De Unico Baptismo" against Petilianus (c. 3, vol. ix., p. 807).

"Cum ad nos venit, &c. When a Schismatic or a Heretic comes to us to be made a Catholic, we annul his schism or heresy by the use of dissuasion and refutation; but if we find in him the same Christian Sacraments which we have ourselves received . . . far be it from us that we should offer violence to them; far be it from us that we should attempt to repeat them when we know that they have been once given; lest while we aim at curing human defects, we condemn divine remedies (medicamenta)."

May not this apply to Presbyterian Ordination as well as to Schismatical or Heretical Baptism? The *Sacramentum*—viz., *the laying on of Hands with Prayer*—is the same in their case as in ours: only the minister is different; but so he was in the case supposed by St Augustine. The point to be insisted on is to *rescind the schism*, by a return for the future to Catholic Regularity.

An attempt has been made quite recently on an occasion of much interest in Edinburgh to ignore our present condition of aggravated schism, or rather to gild it over as a necessary development of "modern knowledge and life;" and in so doing to stigmatise as "mischievous" and reactionary all endeavours to heal our divisions through a return to uniformity either of doctrine or of organisation.[1] On the one hand the new specific would have us to cherish "a sense of

[1] See sermon preached at St Giles' by Rev. Dr Hatch, April 21, 1886; and "published by request;"—whether for better or for worse, a manifest step in the "process of disintegration," and utterly at variance with our Church's "Prayer for Unity."

individuality," and on the other hand "to rejoice," though separated, "in each other's work." Granting that the principles suggested could be found sufficient for those already enrolled in some "Denomination" (though a very little experience of life, and a very little acquaintance with the New Testament will show that they are not sufficient)—granting this, how are the said principles to be applied in the case of those who, whether at home or abroad, are to be brought into the fold? It is to be hoped that, notwithstanding our divisions, we already rejoice in each other's work so far as it is good; but this of itself will not bring us nearer to the fulfilment of the requirements of the Word of God, nor tend to remove the hindrances, which Missionaries complain of[1] as arising out of the pursuit of "individuality," in the way of the evangelisation of the Heathen. And if it be mischievous to point this out, then it is still more "mischievous" to pray, as our Church teaches us, that God in His goodness will "deliver us from all false doctrine, heresy, and schism;" and, again, to beseech Him to "inspire continually the universal Church with the spirit of Truth, Unity, and Concord;" so that "all who do confess His Holy Name *may agree in the Truth of His Holy Word, and live in Unity and Godly Love.*" Nor can we admit the inference that because we may grant the efficacy of ordinances not administered under the one regular system of Church organisation, therefore the one regular system has no existence, or is not obligatory upon all Christians. God may ordain a law, which, for a variety of reasons, He knows to be most expedient and best for us to observe; and yet in His mercy He may so far

[1] See Introduction to No. 7, p. 341, and Appendix, ch. 2.

condone disobedience to the law as not to withhold from us wholly, or even partially, the benefits which obedience to it was intended to convey, especially in after generations not immediately responsible for the transgression; and even in the case of the original transgressors, where there has been much to provoke and to extenuate their disobedience. But obedience to the law will still be the only proper course, and the course from which the greatest amount of blessing is to be looked for in the long run.

One remark remains to be made in bringing these "Appeals" to a conclusion. In laying so much stress as I have done upon the constitution of the Church, it must not be supposed that I forgot that there is another and still more important element to be borne in mind in order to the attainment of Unity among Christians, viz., the element of true Doctrine. But happily the divisions with which we ourselves have to deal have not arisen out of doctrinal points. The great fundamental articles of the Christian Creed have been accepted equally by Presbyterians and by ourselves; and though there may be minor points of difference, yet, in looking back over the History of the Past, I do not find that at any time the disagreement between us has turned upon any other matters than those which concern the right constitution of the Church's ministry and government, or such as are connected more or less directly with that constitution. Former differences arising out of modes of worship, observance of Holy Seasons, &c., &c., are gradually disappearing, or have actually disappeared.

In an Appendix there will be found two short papers, the former of which contains a summary record of the political measures by which our Church

was reduced almost to extinction in the last century; while the latter is designed to show how utterly at variance with the real truth is the notion, more or less current, which the reduction of our numbers has tended to set afloat—viz., that the members of our Church are not for the most part of genuine Scotch extraction, bound to their native land not less devotedly than the most patriotic of their fellow-countrymen, and entitled to claim in it, to the full, the same interests civil and ecclesiastical.

I cordially thank the subscribers—and it is gratifying to me to be able to state that among them are to be reckoned not a few of the foremost and most respected of our Presbyterian Brethren—for the assistance they have given me in bringing these "Appeals" again to the notice of the public. I could have wished to reproduce in two or three additional numbers a selection of the more important letters that have appeared from time to time in the newspapers upon the subject; and it is possible (if it be not too presumptuous so to look forward at the age of fourscore) that this may be done at some future opportunity; but for the present I feel that it would not be reasonable to tax the patience of my readers further.

May our Heavenly Father forgive whatever is amiss in these "Public Appeals in behalf of Christian Unity," and prosper in them whatever has been designed and executed according to His will!

CHARLES WORDSWORTH,
Bishop of St Andrews.

July 31, 1886.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"Whatever may be thought of Dr Wordsworth's panacea for the evils of ecclesiastical divisions, as set forth in his Charge at Perth last week, there can be but one opinion as to his merits in conducting controversy. He is temperate, charitable, fair—even to excess some will think; and tries, what mere polemics seldom do, to put himself as far as possible on the standpoint of his opponents. When it is added that his knowledge and appreciation of Scottish ecclesiastical affairs are quite remarkable, enough has been said to justify his being designated a model controversialist. . . . The Pastoral Address at Perth is a perspicuous and eloquent statement of the Bishop's case."—*The Scotsman.*

"The Bishop of St Andrews, after alluding to matters of Diocesan interest, devoted the greater part of his Charge to an exhaustive consideration of the case of non-Episcopal ordination . . . an able and weighty contribution to a most important discussion.

"With the greater part of what the Bishop has said we cordially agree. His just appreciation of the difficulties which have stood in the way of the acceptance of a pure and primitive Episcopacy in Scotland, his generous recognition of the good fruit which Presbyterianism has to show, and his temperate exposition of the evils that have by natural consequence resulted from the rejection of the Church's historical order viewed simply as an irregularity, come home, as we know, to the Presbyterian mind with a much more persuasive effect than the ordinary cut-and-dry demonstration of the primitive and universal acceptance of Episcopacy.

"Members of the Episcopal Church will read with admiration, and also, we believe, with profit, the Bishop's generous appraisement of the Presbyterian position. Breadth of view is perfectly compatible with fixity of principle; and one of the marks of truth is the absence of exaggeration. The point on which alone we apprehend there will be any divergence of opinion is the sufficiency of the grounds on which the Bishop admits the validity of Presbyterian orders."—*The Scottish Church Review.*

THE CASE OF

NON-EPISCOPAL ORDINATION.

[THE first portion of the Charge, relating to matters in, or connected with, the Diocese of St Andrews, appeared in the *Scottish Guardian* for Friday, September 4th; but not being of general interest beyond the members of our Church, is here omitted.]

I may now pass on to the subject of more general interest, upon which I would wish to speak to you in this Address. It is one which, looking to the posture of ecclesiastical affairs in this country at the present time, appears to me to call for our most earnest attention. I allude to the case of non-Episcopal Ordination, to which I propose to give, so far as my limits will permit, a full and (I trust it will appear) a fair consideration. To begin with the following proposition :—It is perfectly just and safe to argue that when God, by His written Word, and by the guidance of His Spirit and Providence, as shown in the teaching and practice of His Apostles, and in the history, especially the earlier history, of His Church, has, without giving us an express command, pointed out to us sufficiently a way to walk in, with a view to the greatest and most important of all results, and a way intended for continuance to the

end of time (Eph. iv. 11-13), we cannot reasonably expect His favour, and the fulness of His help and blessing, so far as that matter is concerned, unless we are walking in that way. But it is not just or safe to argue that He will withhold His blessing altogether in that respect from those who are walking in a different way. The affirmative argument is a safe one, but the negative argument is not a safe one. We are plainly told by God Himself that His thoughts are not our thoughts, nor His ways our ways (Isaiah lv. 8). He is infinitely more considerate, more merciful. He does not cherish resentment, when He has been slighted and disregarded, as man does. But more than this. We may reasonably believe that God takes into account the manner in which a method or a system which, it may be said, He has pointed out, and virtually, though not expressly, prescribed, is presented for acceptance. If the system has been dishonoured by flagrant disobedience in other respects, or if the sanctions of it have become obscured through lapse of time, or through abuse, or any other cause, it can scarcely be doubted that, however man may still insist upon its indefeasible obligation, God will be prepared to regard it in another light; and especially if He shall see that the same persons who have scrupled at the observance which has been dishonoured and abused, have shown a conscientious and earnest desire to adhere to the guidance of Holy Scripture and Divine Providence upon other points. We may trace an indication of the principle, which I am endeavouring to point out, in the history of the Jewish nation. When, in opposition, to the guidance, and even the

express Word of God, they determined to set a King over them, mainly in consequence, as it would seem, of the lax administration of Eli as judge and high priest, and the reprobate conduct of his two sons, their determination was not only allowed to take effect (1 Sam. xii.), but it did not prevent the full outpouring of the Divine blessing upon the head of King David, the second in the succession, and upon others who followed in the same Royal line.

Now, I wish to apply those remarks to the case of Episcopacy, in order that we may see clearly how far we are justified in arguing for its observance, and what are the cautions to be borne in mind and the limits to be set to that argument.

In the first place, then, we are fully entitled to claim for it a greatly preponderating, and, as I believe, conclusive amount of evidence of Holy Scripture, and a virtually unanimous verdict of Church history, both in the east and west of Christendom, down to the beginning of the sixteenth century; and hence the present Bishop of Durham, Dr Lightfoot, whom I refer to as an authority carrying special weight with our Presbyterian brethren, has characterised the threefold Ministry as the "historical backbone of the Church." I need not repeat the proof of what has now been stated. Some of you may remember that I have drawn it out in detail on former occasions—especially in my Synodical Address for 1864, which dealt with the Scriptural proof, and in that for 1866, which dealt with the historical proof;[1] as I did also in a recent pamphlet (1884),

[1] (*a*) The former has been reprinted in the 8th, the latter in the 9th Number of this series.

entitled "Union or Separation?" Moreover, I may venture to mention my "Outlines of the Christian Ministry" (1872), and my "Remarks on Bishop Lightfoot's Essay" (2nd ed., 1884), both of which have been allowed to remain hitherto without any attempt being made to refute or answer them. The rule therefore, I repeat, during a long period of the Church's past existence, was sufficiently plain and distinct, so that there was nothing to justify a deviation from its observance any more than from the acceptance of the Catholic Creeds. But, as we descend through the so-called Middle or Dark Ages, we come to a very different state of things. For several centuries before the Reformation it cannot be said that there had been in this country, or, indeed, in any country of Western Christendom, any genuine experience of a pure Episcopacy, or, in other words, of the threefold Ministry, founded, as we believe, by Our Lord and His Apostles. The ecclesiastical regimen had been that of simple Popery, which, we have too much reason to know, is a very different thing; and, moreover, it had been sullied and overgrown by abuses, by errors of doctrine, and by viciousness of life; and by superstitions which in many instances amounted to unquestionable idolatry. In short, the Divine ordinance of the Christian Ministry had become so defaced and obscured that it could be no marvel, and certainly no sin, if men failed to recognise it. As an eminent Divine of the Church of England has very justly observed in a recent sermon which I gladly quote (though unable to concur altogether in the position taken up by the preacher on one important point)—

"At the Council of Trent the Papal representatives minimised the authority and rights of the Episcopate down to the very verge of Presbyterianism; indeed, it may be doubted whether any Presbyterian divine could well outdo the Jesuit Lainez in the skill with which, in a sermon historically famous, he endeavoured to reduce the Episcopal rights and jurisdiction to a shadowy impotence."[1] But the most remarkable testimony to the same effect is that of a Pope himself—the celebrated Pope Gregory—at the end of the sixth century. Little anticipating the claim which was to be made by his own successors, when the title of "Universal Bishop" was first assumed by John, then Patriarch of Constantinople, he denounced it as "arrogant, wicked, schismatical, blasphemous, and anti-Christian;" and in a letter, still extant, which he addressed to the Bishops of Greece, he made use of these words—*Si unus universalis est, restat ut vos Episcopi non sitis*—"If there be one universal Bishop, the consequence must be that you are not Bishops."[2] And the truth is, the Church of Rome, through the excessive usurpations of its Pontificate, has virtually lost the threefold Ministry. It has Bishops, but they are not a distinct Order from Presbyters. The Pope not only claims the power of conferring Episcopal functions, such as Ordination, upon simple Presbyters, but he alone has in effect engrossed to himself the Episcopal Order.

It was under circumstances such as those that Presbyterianism took its rise in various countries of

[1] (*a*) "A Father in Christ," by Canon Liddon, p. 13; compare above, No. 2, p. 76.

[2] Greg. Op. vol. ii., p. 742; Epist. v. 18. See No. 2, p. 72.

Europe, and among the rest, here in Scotland. It took its rise, and having been the first (under the guidance of Knox and his Coadjutors, none of whom were Bishops) to cast off the thraldom and corruptions of Rome, it claimed to be the true representative of the National Church. But it was not long before its claim was challenged by a rival, in the person of a revived Episcopacy, which had also cast off the thraldom and corruptions of Popery, and which rested its claim upon surer ground, inasmuch as it could appeal to the Word of God as interpreted, not in subserviency to newly-invented theories, but by the authoritative practice of the primitive, undivided Church. Accordingly, it proved successful, but only through the influence of the Sovereign who had now inherited the English throne in addition to the Scottish, and through the use of methods not strictly national or constitutional, which in the eyes of the people were of greater weight to its disadvantage than its appeals to antiquity, little cared for or understood, were in its favour; and so, after eighteen years, it succumbed to the novel system, which (though imported from Geneva, as the Anti-Reformation system had been imported from Rome), coming forward as the avowed champion of law and liberty, no less than of pure religion, recommended itself far more thoroughly to the popular sentiment, and the popular will. Of the troubles and confusion that set in from 1638 till the period of the Restoration I forbear to speak. Only I would ask, where was the Church of Scotland, where was the validity of Ordination, during the greater part of the foregoing century (1560-1660)? Nor does the case

become mush clearer during the thirty years which followed—*i.e.*, from the Restoration to the Revolution. It is true, Episcopacy had been again restored—restored, as before, from England; but, as it was not pure Episcopacy but Popery which Knox and our first Reformers repudiated, so it was not so much Episcopacy, pure and simple, which was repudiated at the Revolution, as Despotism—Despotism, which had taken Episcopacy by the hand, and kept it in leading-strings, in order to serve the purposes not of true religion, but of a selfish and unscrupulous statecraft; Despotism, moreover, which, as eventually developed, was seeking, secretly and fraudulently, to bring back the nation into ecclesiastical subjection to a foreign Power from which the Reformation had set it free. We may condemn the Puritans, we may condemn the Covenanters; but no fair-minded and intelligent Episcopalian can read the history of the period of restored Episcopacy under Charles II. and James VII. without a burning sense of humiliation and shame. The narrative of Wodrow may be often mistrusted, but his documents for the most part cannot be gainsaid. The tone of Burnet, who also was a Scotchman, a contemporary, and an intimate friend and great admirer of Bishop Leighton, and had personal knowledge of many of the other principal characters of the time, may be perhaps in some respects unduly severe; but it cannot be doubted that the painful record which he gives of the administration of the Church affairs of Scotland in those two reigns is substantially true. And it was under circumstances such as those that Presbyterianism once more came to the front; and the nation was

content again to seek in it a refuge from misrule, without much regard for considerations of a religious kind, beyond security from the corruptions and usurpations of the Church of Rome; pleading, as it did, in the Claim of Right, that it had been "reformed from Popery by Presbyters;" and in that refuge it has rested, with more or less feeling of satisfaction and relief, up to the present time.

But meanwhile, what has been going on? and in what condition does it now find itself? The Lord High Commissioner of the General Assembly for the present year, in an article communicated to a popular magazine,[1] has expressed a very general opinion when he writes (p. 707) that "the divided state of Presbyterianism in Scotland has long been a source of surprise, of regret, and reproach." The "regret" and "reproach" admit of no question; but to one who has learnt to trace the workings of Divine Providence in circumstances such as those which this country has exhibited since the Revolution of 1690, there can be no great matter for "surprise." It is simply an exemplification of the old truth enunciated so forcibly by the poet Æschylus (Agam. 672, *seq.*) —τὸ δυσσεβὲς ἔργον μετὰ μὲν πλείονα τίκτει, σφετέραν εἰκότα γέννᾳ, "the unholy deed afterwards brings forth more, like in birth unto itself." That the deed of the disestablishment of Episcopacy done at the Revolution, however it may be justified, was in some respects an unholy one, cannot be denied. Not only did it involve a breach and formal separation from the regular Catholic system of Church Ministry, but it was carried out by a process of grievous wrong-

[1] (*a*) Lord Aberdeen in the *Fortnightly Review* for May 1885.

doing in several particulars—wrong-doing, however, we must remember, for which a precedent had been given by the restorers of Episcopacy in 1660. The civil authority set at nought the ecclesiastical; and the transference of the endowments was made with little or no regard to existing interests, and with the aggravation, in too many instances, of the infliction of heartless and revolting cruelty. But, though all this be true, who can doubt that the deed would have its extenuating features in the sight of God? For instance, though equally Erastian in its origin, there can be no question that in its practical administration all along the Presbyterian regimen has proved itself far less Erastian than the Episcopal regimen which it superseded. Our Scottish historian, Burton, puts the case strongly but truly when, in comparing not only Episcopacy with Presbyterianism, but Scottish Episcopacy with English, he writes:—"The English clergy, accustomed to more independence, wondered how their Scottish brethren could feel any love for a hierarchy so thoroughly enslaved to the Royal prerogative. The Presbyterian Church, on the other hand, chafed angrily and resolutely against every touch of the Erastian chain" (vol. vii., p. 463). And, if this were so, may it not of itself form a ground for believing that the grace of valid Ordinances, and consequently of a valid Ministry, would not be withheld from a body of professing Christians, who, with the Bible held firmly in their hands, and clasped devoutly to their inmost hearts, had succeeded in extricating themselves and their country from a degrading bondage? And in that respect, at least, might they not even seem to claim with greater

reason the name of Church, inasmuch as they had vindicated more strenuously the rights of its Divine Founder, which their more legitimate rivals had too often pusillanimously and faithlessly surrendered?

And this brings me to the point which I have had more immediately in view in offering to your consideration the foregoing remarks.

The question of the validity or invalidity of Presbyterian Ordination has never yet, I believe, been treated from our side with the breadth of argument of which it is susceptible, and which, on every account, it rightly demands. It is easy to draw up a *catena* of passages from the writings of the best Anglican divines in favour of the exclusive validity of Episcopal Ordination, and so to appear to prove that Episcopacy is essential to the existence of a Christian Church. It is easy, I say, to do this. I myself put together and published, in an early number of the *Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal*, some thirty-four years ago (before I had been made Bishop, and when I was comparatively a novice in ecclesiastical controversy), such a *catena*. The list comprised the names of Archbishop Whitgift, Hooker, Bishop Bilson, Archbishop Bancroft, Bishop Overall (Convocation Book, 1603-10), Dean Field, Archdeacon Mason, Bishop Andrewes, Bishop Carleton, Bishop Hall, K. Charles I.—before the Restoration; and since the Restoration, of Bishop Jeremy Taylor, Bishop Pearson, Dean Hickes, Bishop Beveridge, Bingham, Archbishop Wake, Archbishop Potter, Bishop Horne, Bishop Blomfield, Bishop Philpotts, William Palmer, author of "Origines Liturgicæ," and Christopher Wordsworth, late Bishop

of Lincoln. And, in order to show that the authorities I had produced might be regarded as a fair sample of the whole, I summed up the catalogue by a quotation from the learned Lutheran, Carpzov,[1] where he gives the following question and answer—"*Q. An potestas Ordinandi solis Episcopis competit? R. Negant Lutherani; affirmant Papistæ et Episcopi Anglicani.*" And he might have added on the affirmative side, the whole Church of the East, as appears from the decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem, held in 1672.[2] But it is important to observe that in no one of those many passages which I then produced is any reference made to the rule which our Lord Himself has laid down in the Gospel, in order to guide our judgment in such a case—that is, the case of determining who are false prophets—viz., "By their fruits ye shall know them" (Matt. vii. 15-20). And further, let it be pointed out that in the greater number of those passages the question is regarded no otherwise than as a matter of *regularity* and *good order*, the point of *validity* being kept out of view. And so when Carpzov uses the word "competit," we may quite correctly understand him to mean, whether the power of ordaining *properly appertains* to Bishops alone, without any opinion being pronounced in regard to the effects of Ordination performed otherwise. Bishop Andrewes, in his "Answer" to Peter Moulin, a French Protestant, had used the same word—*potestas Ordinandi Episcopis solum competit;*[3] but then further on he adds—

[1] "Isagoge in Librr. Eccles. Luther, Symbol," p. 430.

[2] See Kimmel's "Monumenta," pp. 437-42.

[3] "Opusc. Posth.," p. 182.

"It does not therefore follow that a Church cannot stand without Episcopacy; for a man must be blind who does not see Churches standing without it;" only (he argues) looking to the example of all antiquity, every Church that has lost, ought to endeavour to recover it, "*ubi Deus dederit, et res ferent*"—*i.e.*, when God shall grant the opportunity, and circumstances shall permit;[1] a passage quoted with approval by Archbishop Bramhall (vol. iii., p. 518). The truth is, that time, as it passes on, presents us with facts which prove too strong for those who would maintain the exclusive theory. In the eyes of our great Divines, from the Reformation downwards, the *irregularity* of non-Episcopal Ordination was indeed abundantly manifest, as it is still, and must ever so remain, unless we are to be blind to the history of the Church for the first fifteen centuries; but there had not been time sufficient to enable them to judge how far, through the overflowing mercy of God, it might or might not be capable of producing the genuine fruit of the Christian ministry, such as we now see produced abundantly by Ministries, which, nevertheless (looking, I say, to Christendom as it has been from the beginning, and, for the most part, still is), we venture to call *irregular*. Some, indeed, there were, among the earliest and best of those Divines, who went far towards anticipating that fruit. Not only did they recognise Presbyterianism as a necessity, in preference to the usurpations and practical idolatry of the Church of Rome—this we have seen in Bishop Andrewes, and it may be seen also, among

[1] "Opusc. Posth.," p. 191; see also p. 211.

others, in Hooker (E. P. vii., ch. xiv. 11); in Dean Field (bk. iii., p. 157); in Bishop Cosin (vol, iv., pp. 403 and 408); and in Archbishop Wake (M'Laine's "Mosheim," vol. vi., p. 124, *seq.*)—but when that necessity, in the good providence of God, had been more or less removed, still they contemplated the continuance of the Divine favour, in the case of Churches which, to use the words of Archbishop Bramhall, not only "through new necessity," but "through ignorance, or new-fangleness, or covetousness, or practice of some persons, have swerved from the Apostolic rule and primitive institution." And again—to cite the same high authority—"I do not make this way (of Episcopal Ordination) to be simply necessary, but only show what is safest, where so many Christians are of another mind. I know there is a great difference between a *valid* and a *regular* ordination; . . . and, for my part, I am apt to believe that God looks upon His people in mercy with all their prejudices."[1] Hence it appears that those great Divines to whom I have referred did not speak of "necessity," as bearing upon this question, in any strict or narrow sense. They would admit a quasi-necessity, not, indeed, as permanent, but as temporary, arising out of long-standing associations or inherited circumstances. They would admit a moral necessity caused not only by ecclesiastical but by civil despotism. And this those divines did, or were prepared to do, when they had not lived to see what we have seen. They had not witnessed the abundant grace of God poured out upon non-Episcopal Churches in the work which

[1] Vol. iii. p. 475, *seq.*; see also p. 517.

they have done for our holy religion both in other ways, and especially in the conversion of the heathen —work which constrained the late Metropolitan of Cape Town, an Anglican Churchman of the strictest school, in communicating with the Presbyterian ministers of the Dutch Reformed Church with a view to union—constrained him, I say, to use these words, speaking for himself and for the other Bishops of South Africa, of whom the [late] Bishop of Edinburgh was one :—"We do not doubt that the Holy Ghost works in the conversion of souls to God in and through your ministry. It would, in our judgment, be sinful to doubt this. Wherever there is godliness there must be grace, and the Author of it." And, to bring the matter home to our own country, that among our Presbyterian brethren of all denominations in this land there is godliness—godliness shown abundantly by its fruits—which of us is there who for a moment doubts? And if it be objected that, of recent years, their zeal has been due more than might be wished to an unhealthy spirit of competition and rivalry in regard to their home schemes, yet no such objection can be raised against the evidence to be drawn from the abundant fruit of Christian enterprise, and loving, large-hearted charity displayed in their Foreign Missions. Again, look at the learned theologians who have represented non-Episcopal bodies, and who have been cordially welcomed on our side as fellow-labourers in the great and sacred work of revising our authorised translation of Holy Scripture, which has been brought to its completion within the present year. But while we cannot deny — nay, we gratefully and joyfully

acknowledge—all this, we must be permitted to point out that the Apostolic rule (as we regard it) has not left itself without witness; for there is one fruit—the fruit to be expected from the observance of rule and method—which it is certain the irregularity of Presbyterianism has not produced; I mean *the fruit of Unity;* the fruit of harmonious, brotherly co-operation in all Christian work.[1] And let it be remembered that even St Jerome, when he lowers to the utmost the authority of Bishops, yet admits that it arose, and ought to be maintained, as "a remedy against schism" (*in schismatis remedium*), and for the preservation of order and discipline in the Church;[2] while St Chrysostom speaks of "the matter of Ordination"—τὸ τῶν χειροτονιῶν—as

[1] (*a*) Dr Donald Macleod, in a note of his St Giles' Lecture (1885), p. 11, objects to any advantage being claimed for Episcopacy over Presbyterianism upon the ground stated above as inconsistent with historical facts. I cannot pretend to give an answer that shall be wholly satisfactory within the space here available; but I may remark (1) I do not argue that Episcopacy of itself and under all circumstances is a security against disunion; (2) The corruption and idolatrous tendencies of the Churches in the East were punished by heretical divisions, and eventually by the scourge of Mahometanism; (3) In England, though Sects have dropt off from the Church, mainly through her own supineness, there has been no breach in the body that bears the slightest comparison with that of the disruption caused in this country by the Free Church; (4) Even so devoted a Presbyterian as Professor Mitchell complains, "That there are no divisions in any part of the Christian Church, the continuance of which seems to all but ourselves so *uncalled for or incapable of being defended on the ground of vital principle* as those which now subsist among the Presbyterians of Scotland," St Giles' Lecture, 1886, p. 326. Compare above, No. 2, p. 66. And with reference to Dr Macleod's remark on the use of the word "schism" by St Paul, see No. 3, p. 121.

[2] Epist. cxlvi., ad Evangel. vol. i., p. 1194.

that "which more than anything else holds the Church together"—*μάλιστα συνέχει τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν*.[1] Hence it is that the Reformed Church of England, *since* the Restoration, without pronouncing non-Episcopal Ordination to be invalid, but rather, in some ways, intimating the contrary (as she did still more plainly *before* the Restoration), has, nevertheless, insisted upon Ordination by a Bishop as essential for admission to her own Ministry.

I have said that the absence of the fruit of Unity, however much it may be confessed and deplored—as it is very generally confessed and very generally deplored—is no matter for surprise. The surprise would be due if a Divine Ordinance, designed to produce and maintain Unity, could be set at naught, and yet Unity could be maintained. And so, if Presbyterianism could show itself capable of effecting Unity in the present (with the fifteen centuries of the past it could not possibly effect it)—if this were so, Unity being one great end of Church polity, we might conceive, upon the principle laid down by Hooker in his third book (Ch. x. 4-8), that eventually it might be suffered to eclipse and supersede Episcopacy. But we see no reason to expect this—rather, it must be said, we see reason to expect the contrary; although as the States of the world become more democratic, we need not wonder if a tendency to Presbyterianism should proportionally increase. It is certain that many of the most intelligent Presbyterians in this country at the present day do not desire to see union brought about merely upon a Presbyterian platform. They would dislike, and

[1] Epist. i. ad Tim. Hom. xvi. 31, vol. xi. p. 691.

would withstand, any attempt to sweep away their system—and in such dislike they are more than justified upon many grounds ; but they are conscious of its imperfections, and they would wish to see it improved.[1] They do not disguise from themselves the fact that "no kind of Presbyterianism"—according to the testimony of our impartial Scottish historian—"was ever prevalent with the gentry ;"[2] and this they naturally consider no slight defect. They who are members of the Established Church would not be sorry to find it brought into ecclesiastical communion with the Church of England, provided this could be done, as I believe it might, without adopting the imperfections of that Church, and without sacrificing its own advantages, or surrendering its own independent basis. Nor are views like these confined to men of large and patriotic sentiments such as Professor Milligan. In the speech which Dr Phin delivered in London two months ago, at the annual meeting of the English Church Defence Institution, he made no secret of his antipathy, not indeed to Presbyterianism itself, but to the narrow disintegrating spirit which, even when it professes a zeal for union, it sometimes displays.

Do I then, by all this argument, annul or weaken the law of Episcopacy and of the threefold Ministry? Nay, rather, I strengthen the law. I bring it into harmony with the thoughts which we are bound to entertain of the mercy and loving-kindness of God, and of the effectual working of His Holy Spirit. I reconcile it with the facts which come daily and hourly within the ken of our own experience. At

[1] See above, "Opinions, &c.," p. 664. [2] Burton, vol. viii. p. 413.

the same time I hold, with Archbishop Bramhall, that "we cannot grant the integrity or perfection of a Church which is non-Episcopal without swerving from the judgments of the Catholic Church" (vol. iii., p. 518). Nor is this all. If, on the one hand, I have shown that our best Divines shrink from condemning the non-Episcopal Churches of foreign Protestants under the circumstances which drove them from the communion of the Church of Rome, I must also add that there was not one of those same Divines who would have been prepared to justify the state of division in which we now find ourselves in this country—that is, a state of division among Protestants themselves; or to recognise the assumption by which each one of our separate religious bodies, however heterodox or insignificant, arrogates to itself the name of Church. Such, I say, is the position which I hold myself, and would recommend to you. But how is it with those who take, what they themselves would call, higher ground; who deny the *validity* of all non-Episcopal ministrations? If the good works which we all see and know can be done without a valid Ministry, without valid Ordinances, may it not be asked, where is the great importance of a valid Ministry and valid Ordinances? It is thus that extreme arguments, like an over-loaded gun, recoil to the injury of those who use them. But the argument from *irregularity* is liable to no such objection. On the contrary, it is strengthened by the fact that, whereas all other good works are done notwithstanding the broken law, the one special good work which is the more immediate object of the law—viz., the co-operation of Christians in one body, as enjoined

and prayed for by Christ Himself—is not done; and the more the absence of it is felt, and regretted and deplored, the more it appears to elude our grasp. Nor can it can be safely urged in answer to my present argument, that the rule of the Episcopal or threefold Ministry (supposing that we accept it as Catholic and Apostolic) ceases to be binding when it has been grievously abused, which, we admit, has unhappily been the case at various periods, and even for a long continuance, in the history of the past. "*Abusus rei non tollit usum*," and least of all in Divine things. No man ever abused the sacred office and ministry as Judas did; and yet we are expressly assured by the Holy Ghost, it was needful that he should have a successor. On the other hand, in dealing with this question, we must not allow ourselves to be carried away by any merely mechanical or imperfect view of what is called Apostolic succession, or, in other words, of the continuity of the Ministry and of the Church itself. That continuity consists in Doctrine at least as much as in Order; and it may be claimed upon the former ground by all bodies that accept the Articles of the Christian Creed. More than this. It may reasonably be doubted whether orthodox non-Episcopal bodies have not done more to maintain the true Apostolic succession, as explained and insisted on by Irenæus and Tertullian, than the Church of Rome has done; which has gone so far, by alterations and additions, to corrupt the simplicity not only of the Apostolic Ministry but of the Apostolic Doctrine; whereas the only true and perfect continuity consists, as I have said, in having retained or recovered both. Such,

through the mercy of God, and through the faithfulness of our forefathers, is our position, as it is also of the Church of England and its Branches throughout the world; and such we earnestly hope and pray may become the position of others who do not at present fully occupy it, no less than of ourselves.

For my own part, I must confess that since I became a Bishop, and as such made it my duty to give my best attention to this subject, I have learned, without any conscious sacrifice of principle, and with (I hope) maturer judgment, and as the result of much study and reflection—I have learned, I say, to take a deeper and a broader view of it than I did at first. It is true I soon began to see that the real question at stake was not so much adhesion to this or that form of Church polity for its own sake, as for the sake of the bond of union which it might afford; and looking at the history of the Church from the beginning and as a whole, I could not doubt that the only reasonable hope of the healing of our separations, and of the restoration of Unity, was to be looked for not in the parity of a single Order of Clergy—an innovation dating only from the sixteenth century—but in the "divers Orders" of an Episcopal or threefold Ministry, which has come down to us from the beginning. It is now thirty years ago since, in the third year of my Episcopate, I delivered a series of four lectures upon Unity at Edinburgh, at St Andrews, at Perth, and at Forfar; and towards the conclusion of the last of those lectures I spoke as follows:—"If it were a question, as many have represented it, of words and names; if it were a question merely of Episcopacy against Presbytery, of

a Prelacy of Bishops against a Parity of Clergy; or even if it were a question, as is commonly supposed, of a well or ill constituted form of Church government; if this were all, or even the chief portion of the matter which is at stake, I should scarcely have ventured to come forward and claim for it, as I have done, so large a share of public attention. But if the question be—as indeed it is, and as, I trust, ere long it will be seen to be—between the Unity which Christ prayed for in His mystical Body, and the rending of that Body which He forbade; between hopes of grace and mysterious assistance, which are founded upon the observance of that command, and the same hopes when based upon no such foundation; if the question and the contention be not who shall be first and greatest amongst us, as seeking his own things, or the pre-eminence of his sect, but rather who shall be least as seeking the things that are Jesus Christ's, as desiring to sink all that is individual or partial in dutiful communion with the one Body and one Spirit; —then this will be a controversy to which your earnest, your patient, your prolonged attention may well be called, and in which I account it not the least honour of my sacred office that it not only permits but requires me to engage."

The obligation on our part which those words express certainly has not diminished since they were first uttered. And I am persuaded that if we are to act upon that obligation with any hope of success, upon a scale at all commensurate with the necessity of the case, it will not be by exaggerating our own claims, or denying the claims of those who at present acquiesce in a non-Episcopal Ministry, but by hold-

ing the balance fairly and impartially between the two. I remember when many years ago that good man, the late Dr Hanna, the son-in-law of Dr Chalmers, and the colleague in Edinburgh of Dr Guthrie, said to me frankly the only time I had the pleasure of meeting him—the occasion was a memorable one, for the [late] Prime Minister was present and heard our conversation—"Well, Bishop, what hope have you that this agitation about union will come to anything?" and when I had replied that the matter was in God's hands, and that in His good time we may hope it will bear fruit, he rejoined immediately, "Well, for my part, I have no objection to a liturgy. I have no objection to Episcopacy; only you must not press us too much about our orders." The words left a lasting impression upon my mind. I felt sure that so good a man would not have ventured to act as a Minister of the Gospel without a sanction which he considered sufficient; and that so able a man would not have considered a sanction sufficient without reasons which were at least entitled to respect. And ever since I have been of opinion that a full, fair, and temperate discussion of the question of Ordination by persons competently learned, who have given their attention to it in all its bearings, would tend more than anything else, with God's blessing, to heal our divisions. In the sentiments which I have now expressed with this object in view, it is no small satisfaction to me to feel that I have the substantial concurrence of an Episcopal colleague so able and experienced as the [late] Bishop of Edinburgh. In a Charge delivered to his Clergy in 1872, after insisting upon our duty

to testify to "that Apostolic order which, through the good providence of God, we have inherited," he proceeded thus:—"Does this require of us that we shall cease to regard as brethren those who love and honour the same Divine Redeemer? Does it justify us in speaking of such men, who have not caused divisions, but inherited them, as guilty of the sin of schism? Does it excuse us, when we dishonour the Holy Ghost, Who is pleased to work abundantly by their ministrations, by speaking of that work with contempt? Nay, does it justify us in drawing a line of demarcation round ourselves and saying—'The temple of the Lord are we?'" Again, in his Charge for 1877, he repeated the same most needful and salutary admonition:—"We must remember," he said, "that the firm and steadfast maintenance of the law of Unity is not only compatible with the utmost charity towards those who differ from us . . . but further, that it is quite consistent with a full, hearty, and unreserved acknowledgment of the blessing given by the Spirit of Christ to those who do not recognise and value that Order in the Church to which we witness as essential to organic Unity. If this was the case, as it was, even in Apostolic times, when that Order was confirmed by miraculous signs, how much more ought we now, when so much has occurred in the history of Christianity to obscure the testimony of that Order; when there are so many associations, especially in this land, that prevent men from considering impartially the question at issue; and when so much that is noble and excellent, and righteous, and true, is thrown into the opposite scale; —how much more, I say, are we, in the present day,

bound to acknowledge the work of God among those who see not as we see, lest, while we suppose ourselves zealous for Christ and His Church, we be found sinning against that very law of Unity which the Church represents"—I would rather say, was designed to represent—"if not against the Holy Ghost Himself" (p. 32, *seq.*).

There is one other topic upon which I would wish to say a few words, and then I will conclude.

We know how in former days it was customary to connect and to denounce Popery and Prelacy in the same sentence of condemnation; and there are still, I believe, not a few of our Presbyterian brethren who, by pointing to the connection which they suppose to exist between the two, are not displeased to find an excuse for standing out against the overwhelming evidence, both Scriptural and historical, which we are able to produce in favour of a prelatical or threefold Ministry. For instance, the venerable and learned Moderator of the Free Church Assembly for the present year [Principal David Brown], in his opening address, after generously admitting that a vast change for the better had come over the Church of England since he was young, nevertheless complained that "much earnestness is to be seen of an unwholesome kind, whilst the most active parties and the most confident are those who are doing their best to preach and practice whole and total Romanism in their own Church" (p. 22). The description is overdrawn, but I fear we must confess there is some foundation for it. And if there be, then it is plain that persons who are so acting do in fact, so far as they are concerned, bring

back the very case of "necessity" which our old Divines allowed as sufficient to justify separation from Bishops who were subject to the Church of Rome. The respected Moderator to whom I just now referred made no mention of our own Church, and I would fain hope and believe that, though he may not consider all of us altogether innocent of the charge which he brought against certain parties in the Church of England, he would acquit us of being guilty to the same extent. In our case, indeed, the fault, so far as it exists, is certainly more unpardonable, inasmuch as it betrays forgetfulness or disregard of the grievous punishment which our Church has suffered, and is still suffering, primarily in consequence of that offence. And of this we may rest assured, that the hope which has begun to brighten of dissipating prejudice and of regaining influence over the mass of our fellow-countrymen still unhappily estranged and separated from us through former unfaithfulness and misgovernment, will be again obscured, unless we are careful to give no reasonable cause for the suspicion that we desire either to restore the peculiar teaching and modes of worship, or to imitate the exclusive arrogance and impracticability of the Church of Rome. But I must not take merely a one-sided view, or stop short of speaking the whole truth. It is no less certain that in the circumstances in which our Church, and the Church (to use the name in the widest sense) of this country, now stands, a fearful responsibility is incurred by all of us, whether Clergy or Laity, if we fail, in our respective callings and position, to exhibit our communion, as at once *truly reformed* and *truly*

catholic, to the best advantage; that is, by showing zeal—devoted, judicious, conscientious zeal—in its behalf, and by avoidance of all occasions of offence, either by careless neglect of duty on the one hand, or, on the other hand, by indiscretion and extravagance in its discharge.

One word more. I confess I look forward with no little anxiety to the way in which, four years hence, the Bicentenary of the Revolution of 1689—whether or no I may live to see it—will be observed amongst us; for that it will be observed after some fashion, in these days when the sentiment in favour of such commemorations has become so strong and popular, there can be little doubt. Is the occasion to be used to accentuate our divisions, to exasperate our disagreements, to give renewed life to an unbrotherly spirit of partisanship, by reproducing and stereotyping afresh misrepresentations upon either side?[1] Or rather

[1] (*a*) I could have wished that my respected friend, the last year's Moderator of the General Assembly, in his recent St Giles' Lecture (Feb. 21, 1886), which he closes with a reference to "the approaching Bicentenary of the Revolution settlement," and to what he considers "its glorious memories of Peace and Reconciliation among Brethren long divided and oppressed," had been able to take a *wider*, and *more Catholic* view of Reunion than that which he advocates so warmly, and which appears to consist in nothing more than a "reconstruction of Presbyterianism upon the old Historic lines;" that is, principally, the *narrow*, *un-Catholic*, and *non-Historical* lines of the 17th century. If the "approaching Bicentenary" is to be celebrated upon those lines, and if still no place is to be found for Episcopalians in the "National Church," except upon terms which the Leaders of that Church have again and again been challenged to justify and defend, then most certainly it will be a sad year not only for Scotland, but also for the Church of Christ throughout the world. For a true character of the Revolution settlement *in its Ecclesiastical aspect*, as regards Scotland, see above, p. 694 *sq.*; and No. 10, p. 574, note 1.

are we all, Presbyterians and Episcopalians alike, to show a determination to rise above all such uncharitableness by speaking the truth—and nothing but the truth—in love, by studied moderation in our respective claims, and by endeavouring to turn the lessons which we have all to learn from the past to their true account; so that we may at once take warning from its errors and excesses, and derive encouragement from whatever examples of earnest piety and genuine patriotism it has handed down to us for our help and guidance in the time to come? During two centuries we, as a Church, have been expiating the sins of our forefathers; surely this should be enough. At the Restoration it is calculated that 350 Ministers were turned out of their respective charges as nonconformists to Episcopacy (Burton vii., 160-428); the Clergy turned out at the Revolution as non-jurors and nonconformists to Presbyterianism could scarcely have been fewer, probably they were more (*Ibid.* 458). The Church and State of England, as desiring to proclaim an amnesty of past discords, has, not long since, abandoned the ecclesiastical observance alike of the Restoration and of the Revolution. It will be an unspeakable blessing if, when the time shall come for us to observe the latter, the spirit of truth and love shall so far prevail that it may lead us not only to forgive and forget the animosities of the past, but to inaugurate a better and a happier era for the time to come. And surely we have need. The distant heathen are crying out to us for help; and we know from our Lord's own Prayer, on the eve of His crucifixion, the condition under which that help, if it is to be fully blessed in

proportion to the need, must be sought. At home we are staggered with the statistics of ruinous intemperance, and shocked with the revelations of monstrous impurity. We may have recourse to various devices for the checking of those evils—as indeed we do, and I earnestly hope with some advantage, although such devices have, for the most part, their weak side, as tending, more or less, to confound the true perspective of moral duty,[1] and to invalidate rather than to strengthen the all-embracing sanctions of the Christian ideal in its perfection;—but so long as the condition of the Church itself, with its divisions and sub-divisions, is a social evil of the first magnitude, utterly inconsistent with the requirements of Holy Scripture, we cannot reasonably expect it to grapple firmly and effectually with other evils, alike, but not more strongly, condemned in the Word of God. The abeyance or inefficiency of all Church discipline, which is a necessary consequence of our divisions, and the abandonment by our non-Episcopal bodies of the sacred ordinance of Confirmation, are, I believe, among the foremost causes of the moral corruption and depravity which we must all deplore; and the main remedy for them must be sought, not in human devices, but in the more faithful and diligent use of those means of edification and grace, in which we may confidently look for the co-operation and blessing of the Spirit of God, "without Whom," as our Church reminds us, "nothing is strong, nothing is holy."

[1] See my Address to the Students at Aberdeen, Feb. 21, 1886.

APPENDIX.

CHAPTER I.

ON THE CAUSES WHICH LED TO THE REDUCED NUMBERS OF EPISCOPALIANS IN SCOTLAND.

It may be desirable to state the steps by which, after Episcopacy had been disestablished at the Revolution in 1689 (in consequence of the refusal of the then Bishops to transfer their allegiance from the Stuart family to William III.), its adherents became subject to disabilities and penalties sufficient to account for the small number to which they have been reduced. At the same time it is most important to bear in mind that this reduction has ceased to be apparent in the upper and more independent classes, which now consist of Episcopalians in greater proportion than of any other denomination—a fact sufficient to induce the belief that *more and fuller opportunities of instruction and free choice* would, in all probability, soon tend to redress the inequality in regard to the religious profession of the other classes of the Scottish people, who are now to a great extent Presbyterians by an *inherited necessity*.

In 1695 (King William III.), an Act was passed in the Scotch Parliament by which all deprived, *i.e.*, Episcopal, Ministers were forbidden to celebrate Marriages or Baptisms under pain of imprisonment.

In 1711 (Queen Anne), after the Union with England, which was effected in 1707, the British Parliament repealed the above act, and at the same time passed an Act of toleration, whereby it was declared to be "free and lawful for all those of the Episcopal communion in that part of Great Britain, called Scotland, to meet and assemble for the exercise of divine worship, to be performed after their own manner." During the previous twenty-two years, therefore, this had been

unlawful. But it was still required that the Clergy who were to officiate must take the oaths of allegiance and abjuration, which most of them, and especially *all the Bishops*, being adherents of the cause of the Stuart family, would refuse to do.

In 1715 (King George I.), the first Jacobite insurrection—the principal insurgents being "Episcopalians"—led to the renewal of more stringent measures against the supporters of Episcopacy.

In 1745 (King George II.), the last Jacobite insurrection was followed by penal Acts still more severe, and which affected not only the (Non-juring) clergy, but the laity who attended their ministrations.

1. All their "meeting houses" were to be shut up.
2. An ordinary dwelling was to be regarded as a "meeting house" *if more than four persons*, not of the family, assembled in it for the purpose of divine worship.
3. A Clergyman who transgressed the law was to be *imprisoned six months* for the first offence, and, for the second, *transported for life*.
4. The laity who transgressed were, for the first offence, to be *fined five pounds*, and, for the second, *imprisoned two years*, besides various penalties and disabilities imposed both upon Peer and Commoner in other ways; such as *exclusion from Parliament, from all offices civil and military, from voting at elections parliamentary or municipal*, &c.
5. In order to prevent as far as possible the continued existence of *a native Episcopal Church and Clergy in Scotland*, toleration was to be granted only to those Clergymen who derived their Orders from the *English* and *Irish* Churches. No others were allowed even to *qualify* by taking the required oaths. Thus the National Episcopate was entirely proscribed and extirpated, as far as it could be extirpated by parliamentary enactment. But the Episcopal succession was faithfully kept up in secret until the "tyranny was overpast," and the Clergy continued to minister to their people as

best they could, in small numbers within their own houses, at different hours and on every day in the week: on a Sunday especially it was not uncommon for the same clergyman to go over the service as many as ten or twelve times.[1]

The aforesaid penal laws were formally repealed in 1792 (King George III.), but their previous effect in reducing the numbers of our Church may be inferred from the fact that in 1784, eight years before their repeal, there were only four Bishops, and about forty other Clergy, in communion with them. See Grub's "Ecclesiastical History," vol. iv. p. 91. The same author adds, "There are no means of ascertaining the numbers of the Laity, but they were not probably a twentieth part of the Scottish nation."

A diminution of numbers once effected, so as to operate in geometrical proportion, is, no doubt, very difficult to repair; but the tide has turned—we are now in the way to surmount the difficulty; only then, having a cause so holy and so righteous—THE CAUSE OF TRUTH AND UNITY—let us all, both Clergy and Laity, do our best as in the sight of God, and as in view of the account which we shall all one day have to render to our Divine Master.

We have now seven Bishops and about 260 of other Clergy. Originally, that is, before the disestablishment in 1689, there had been two Archbishops, twelve Bishops, and about 1100 Parish Ministers.

CHAPTER II.

EPISCOPALIANS IN SCOTLAND NOT ALIENS.

The following letter, which appeared in *The Edinburgh Courant* on November 30, last year, will speak for itself:—

[1] See the Rev. James (afterwards Bishop) Walker's Sermon upon the Funeral of Bishop Strachan, who died at Dundee, in 1810, aged ninety. "During the period in which the penal laws were enforced, he has been known to read prayers *twelve times in one day* to twelve different congregations, consisting each of the legal number," *i.e.*, not more than four persons.

"SIR,—Some days ago I received a pamphlet temperately written, and apparently well meant, on 'The Scotch Church Question,' from Mr A. R. Macfie of Dreghorn, in which, while proposing that 'the Government should promote a conference of a select number of Scotchmen connected with the principal Presbyterian bodies, who shall be charged to exchange opinions, and to propound some scheme adapted to the changed ecclesiastical state of the nation,' the writer says that he does not include us, Episcopalians, in the proposal, because we 'are not only not numerous, but *chiefly not of Scotch* birth and descent' (p. 9).

"Being well aware that the representation conveyed in those last words is far from correct, however generally entertained and frequently repeated, I have thought it desirable, in the interests of the truth upon a matter of such importance, to endeavour to ascertain the real state of the case: and as the Diocese with which I have the honour to be connected may be fairly taken as an example, being the most central, and also one of the most extensive (including Perthshire, Fife, Clackmannan, Kinross, and the greater part of Forfarshire), I determined to request each of my Clergy to favour me with a report of the *bona fide* numbers of Scotchmen and English or non-Scotchmen which compose his own congregation. In answer to this request I have received returns from all our congregations, and I proceed to give the result, as follows:—At Alyth and Meigle Scotchmen in proportion to non-Scotchmen are more than ten to one; at Blairgowrie, three to one; at Bridge of Allan, two to one: at Burntisland, more than three to one; at Callander, five to one; at Coupar-Angus, about six to one; at Crieff (400), all Scotch; at Culross, three to one; at Cupar-Fife, about two to one; at Dollar, more than two to one; at Doune, ten to one; at Dunblane, nearly four to one; at Dunfermline, thirty to one; at Dunkeld, two to one; at Dunning, two to one; at Forfar, fifty to one; at Glamis, numbers equal; at Kenmore, about five to one; at Kinross, seven to one; at Kirkcaldy, a decided majority; at Kirriemuir, fifty to one; at Leven, four to one; at Muthill, thirteen to one; at Newport, a majority; at Perth, St Ninian's, two to one; St John's, about three to one; at Pitlochry, more

than three to one ; at Pittenweem, ten to one ; at St Andrews, nearly three to one ; at Weem, nine to one.

"It will be observed that in all but one of the above returns the Scottish element preponderates over the non-Scottish ; that in many cases the preponderance is very great ; that at Crieff, in a congregation of four hundred, my informant does 'not think there is a single family which is not of Scotch birth and descent ;' that in another instance—viz., Forfar (where within the last ten years I have held seven Confirmations, and confirmed upwards of 500 of all ages from 13 to 70, and among them all not more than ten that were not 'Scotch by birth and descent'), the result is, I am assured, that 'in a congregation of men, women, and children, which may be fairly stated at 1000, it would be exceedingly difficult to enumerate twenty souls that are of English birth or descent.' Looking to our other dioceses, if we take the four which are to the north, or east, or west of this—viz., Moray and Ross, Aberdeen and Orkney, Brechin, and Argyll and the Isles—I have no doubt that the comparative proportions of Scotchmen and non-Scotchmen would be still more (I ought, I believe, to say very much more) decidedly in favour of the former ; while if we take our two southern dioceses—Edinburgh, and Glasgow and Galloway—the result would, I suppose, be the other way ; but still such as to exhibit a very clear and marked preponderance of Scotch over non-Scotch adherents.

"So much for our genuine nationality. With regard to our total number, it is true we are still 'not very numerous' in comparison with 'the principal Presbyterian bodies ;' our Church having been ruthlessly stamped out all over the country, with few exceptions, through the exterminating operation of the penal laws—laws excessively harsh and severe, but which, it must be confessed, our forefathers in the last century brought upon themselves through their devoted adherence to the Stewart family. But ever since the repeal of those laws our numbers have steadily risen, especially in the chief centres of population, where our previous losses were more easily retrieved ; and they are now increasing in such a way, and in such a variety of localities, as to prove beyond question that there is nothing in the character or disposition of Scotchmen

to make them prefer Presbyterian to Episcopal forms of worship, or even the Presbyterian to the Episcopalian form of Church government, *but rather the contrary*, wherever a choice between the two is fairly presented to them. Nor is this to be wondered at, because our Church government now includes the main elements of Presbyterianism, in our vestries, Diocesan Synods, Church Councils, and General Synods, just as Presbyterianism has now begun to include the main elements of Episcopal worship in read prayers, devotional postures, hymns, chants, and organs. And further, let it be borne in mind that no Presbyterian body comprehends nearly so large a proportion of the proprietors of the soil, our numbers including probably not less than one-half; others have calculated it at two-thirds; and certainly we possess much more than an average proportion of the intelligence of the country.[1]

"In any satisfactory settlement of 'the Scotch Church question,' whether in favour of continued Establishment (which, in my opinion, is infinitely to be preferred) or of Disestablishment, the matters which I have now touched upon, and which hitherto have been kept far too much out of sight, must be taken nto account. To repudiate all consideration for the Episcopal Church in this country, and still more to express towards it open or ill-disguised hostility, while the attempt is made to hang on by the skirts of the Episcopal Church in England, and while high esteem and admiration are professed for that Church (which is in the fullest communion with our own, but in its government is further removed from the Presbyterian Churches than ours is), this, it must be said, is not a very consistent or very dignified position. It is a position which cannot fail to be regarded with some degree of scorn by all honest Liberationists; and however it may find a certain amount of favour at a crisis like the present in the eyes of politicians, and of narrow-minded or self-interested ecclesiastics, it is impossible that it should approve itself to the consciences of earnest and intelligent Churchmen, whether lay or clerical, Presbyterian or Episcopalian, Scotch or English.

"Although the pamphlet of Mr Macfie has been the imme-

[1] See the testimony of Dr R. Wallace, quoted above, No. 10, p. 587.

diate occasion of this letter, I need scarcely say that in requesting you to do me the favour to publish it in your columns, I have a much wider aim than merely to correct a misrepresentation to which that gentleman (without, I am sure, any intention to mislead) has given currency. It was high time that the misnomer of designating our congregations as 'the English Church' should be abandoned. It is high time that persons who are impressed with the present unhappy condition of ecclesiastical affairs in Scotland, and who come forward, as Mr Macfie has done, to make proposals for its amendment, should learn to form a more adequate estimate of the claims of Episcopalians, and should cease to speak of us in language which, as I have shown, is utterly at variance with the facts of the case.—I am, &c.,

"CHARLES WORDSWORTH,
Bishop of St Andrews."

"BISHOPSHALL, ST ANDREWS, *Nov.* 27, 1885."

CORRIGENDA.

P. 32, line 13, *for* "light" *read* "right."
P. 64, line 4, *for* "1703" *read* "1711."
P. 127, line 12, note mark, *for* "2" *read* "1."
P. 142, line 12 from bottom, *for* xiv. 11" *read* "xiv. 14."
P. 197, line 2, *for* "B.C." *read* "A.D."
P. 485, note 2, line 3, *for* "produced below" *read* "produced in No. 4."
P. 538, note, *for* "English, Colonial, and Missionary," *read* "English-Colonial and Missionary."
P. 600, line 10 from bottom, *for* "1876" *read* "1867."
P. 656, line 15, *for* "those days" *read* "these days."

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.
A24931

The following are the Subjects of this Series:—

NUMBER I.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION.

NUMBER II.

OUR CHIEF DANGER AS A NATION: Its Cause and Remedy.

NUMBER III.

UNITY A DIVINE LAW OF UNIVERSAL OBLIGATION.

NUMBER IV.

PROVISION FOR OBSERVANCE OF LAW OF UNITY.

NUMBER V.

THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION IMPARTIALLY EXAMINED.

NUMBER VI.

REUNION OF THE CHURCH IN GREAT BRITAIN.

NUMBER VII.

PLEA FOR UNIFORMITY IN MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH.

NUMBER VIII.

RESPONSE OF EPISCOPALIANS TO MODERATOR'S APPEAL.

NUMBER IX.

THE MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

NUMBER X.

EUODIAS AND SYNTYCHE; OR THE SCOTTISH CHURCH IN ITS RELATIONS, PAST AND PRESENT, TO THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

NUMBER XI.

PROSPECTS OF RECONCILIATION BETWEEN PRESBYTERY AND EPISCOPACY.

NUMBER XII.

THE CASE OF NON-EPISCOPAL ORDINATION IN REFERENCE TO SCOTLAND FAIRLY CONSIDERED.

BX
5320
W6
V.2

Wordsworth, Charles, Bp. of St. Andrews,
Dunkeld and Dunblane, 1806-1892.
Public appeals in behalf of Christian
with reference to the present condition
church in Scotland. Edinburgh, Macniver
Wallace, 1886.
2v. (72lp.) 19cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

1. Episcopal Church in Scotland--Relat
2. Christian union --Scotland. I.

A 24931

CCSC/mmb